

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

The Classical Review

EDITORS: W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D., Perse School House, Cambridge.
A. D. GODLEY, M.A., 27 Norham Road, Oxford.

Board of Management:

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., Chairman.

W. E. P. PANTIN, M.A., Hon. Treasurer.

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., Hon. Secretary.

Prof. GILBERT MURRAY,
LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.R.S.L. With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the
Prof. C. FLAMSTEAD
WALTERS, M.A. Classical Association.

Prof. A. C. CLARK, M.A., Representing the Oxford Philological Society.
Prof. W. RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.B.A., Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago; Principal W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.G., McGill University, Montreal; Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., University of Melbourne; Prof. JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, LL.D., Litt.D., Harvard University.

Vol. XXX

NOVEMBER, 1916

No. 7

CONTENTS

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS:	PAGE	REVIEWS (continued):	PAGE
The Homeric Hymns. VI. T. L. AGAR ..	177	The <i>Anacreon tea</i> . A. S. OWEN ..	197
The Hyperboreans. GRACE H. MACURDY ..	180	Dean's <i>Cognomina of Soldiers</i> . J. G. C. ANDERSON ..	198
Some Notes on Aristophanes. P. GROENEBOOM ..	183	Melmoth, <i>Pliny: Letters</i> . J. WIGHT DUFF ..	200
The Dominion of Peleus. A. SHEWAN ..	184	Three Translations of Virgil. A. D. G. ..	202
Some Cruces in Catullus Reconsidered. J. S. PHILLIMORE ..	186	SHORT NOTICES:	
Misunderstandings of Caesar and Horace. J. P. POSTGATE ..	189	Edwards's <i>English-Greek Lexicon</i> . Σ ..	204
Virg. <i>Ecl.</i> IV. 62. HERBERT W. GREENE ..	191	Robertson, <i>An Introduction to Greek Reading</i> . Σ ..	204
NOTES:		Harmon's <i>Lucian</i> . A. S. OWEN ..	204
Horace, <i>Od.</i> I. xxxiv.-xxxv. H. J. ROSE ..	192	Starkey's <i>Verses Translation from Classic Authors</i> . A. S. OWEN ..	205
Note on Catullus XVII. 17 ff. HAROLD P. COOKE ..	193	IN MEMORIAM:	
REVIEWS:		'Somewhere in France.' H. P. COOKE ..	205
Scott-Moncrieff's <i>Paganism and Christianity in Egypt</i> . T. NICKLIN ..	193	NOTES AND NEWS ..	206
How did the Greeks think about Life? FRANK GRANGER ..	195	CORRESPONDENCE ..	207
BOOKS RECEIVED ..		BOOKS RECEIVED ..	208

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

BOSTON, MASS.: GINN & COMPANY, 29 BEACON STREET

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. net; U.S.A., 30 cents net. Yearly Subscription (Eight Numbers), 7s. 6d., Post Free. U.S.A., \$2.00 net.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at the reduced price of 7s. and 9s. a year respectively (post free), provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public, viz. 7s. 6d. for the *Classical Review*, 12s. 6d. for the *Classical Quarterly*, or 18s. for the two Journals jointly, post free in each case.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed either to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. Williamson, 46, Park Road, Pendleton, Manchester; or to the Hon. Secretaries, Mr. W. H. Duke, Jesus College, Cambridge, and Professor Slater, 4, Chalcot Gardens, London, N.W.; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. G. E. K. Brauholtz, The University, Manchester; Mr. R. W. Reynolds, King Edward's School, Birmingham; Mr. Kenneth Forbes, The University, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss D. Watson, 7, Hughenden Road, Clifton, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, M.A., The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Mr. J. M. MacGregor, Bedford College, London, N.W.; Miss M. E. Pearson, University Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff; Mr. P. W. Dodd, The University, Leeds; and Mrs. R. M. Gray, 13, Marine Lines, Bombay.

NOW READY

DEIGMA. A First Greek Book

BY C. FLAMSTEAD WALTERS, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF CLASSICAL LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON

and R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D.

PROFESSOR OF LATIN IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

With the Co-operation of CONSTANCE I. DANIEL, M.A.

3s. 6d.

In this book Professors Walters and Conway have applied to the teaching of Greek the methods which have proved so successful in their *Limen. A First Latin Book*.

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

MURRAY'S HANDY CLASSICAL MAPS

Edited by G. B. GRUNDY, M.A., D.Litt.

FELLOW AND TUTOR OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, OXFORD

These Maps are now recognized as the best and most convenient in existence for the use of scholars and students at the Universities and upper classes of schools.

The old method of engraving and hatching the mountain ranges has been exchanged for that of colouring the contours with flat brown and green tints, which is acknowledged to be the best and most intelligible way of denoting the configuration of the land. A SEPARATE INDEX IS INCLUDED WITH EACH MAP.

The Maps in this series are distinct from those in Murray's Classical Atlas, and are considerably larger.

ATHENÆUM.—"These maps of Mr. Murray's are far better than anything which has yet been attempted in the direction of teaching the physical features of ancient geography, and they deserve all attention from students and schoolmasters."

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W.

d
n
l
o
e

l.
s.
r.
).
e
e
n.

e
r
f
-
.n
;

,
.



The Classical Review

NOVEMBER, 1916

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

THE HOMERIC HYMNS.

VI.

Hymn Dem. 226 :

παῖδα δέ τοι πρόφρων ὑποδέξομαι ὡς με
κελεύεις·
θρέψω, κοῦ μιν ἔολπα κακοφραδίσοις
τιθήνης
οὐτ' ἄρ' ἐπηλυσίη δηλήσεται οὐθ' ὑπο-
τάμνον·
οἰδα γὰρ ἀντίτομον μέγα φέρτερον ὑλο-
τόμοιο,
οἰδα δ' ἐπηλυσίης πολυπήμονος ἐσθλὸν
ἐρυσμόν.

I reproduce this passage not to reiterate and still less to withdraw my emendation (1896) of 227 by which the telephese of the opening clause was eliminated, but to determine, if possible, the scope and meaning of 228-30. Many suggestions have been offered with which it is not necessary to deal. They turn mainly upon the infantine troubles of worms and teething. What we have to consider is, I am sure, something much more serious. The child's life is endangered in some way. The mother evidently believes that it is doubtful whether he can be successfully reared. It is not necessary to accept Ovid's statement in the *Fasti* IV. 538 that the child was actually *in extremis*:

Iam spes in puerō nulla salutis erat.

Our Hymn is sufficient to reveal the family anxiety and apprehension. In 165 Callidice says :

εἰ τόν γ' ἐκθρέψαιο καὶ ἥβης μέτρον
ἴκοιτο,

NO. CCLX. VOL. XXX.

and this is repeated, with the omission of the significant *ἐκ-* by Metaneira herself (221), who as soon as she hears about Demeter from her daughters send them back to engage her at once regardless of all business principles 'at an unlimited salary,' *ἐπ' ἀπειρονι μισθῷ* (173). When she sees Demeter, she tells her that the child is *όψιγονος καὶ ἄελπτος*, implying that he is delicate, and as before said, may require constant care to bring him to man's estate, *ἥβης μέτρον*.

What, then, is the service expected from Demeter and promised by her in these lines? Clearly that she will guard the child from all the ailments that threaten life in the long period from infancy to manhood. In these early days all or most illnesses were attributed to magic, and magic must be met by superior magic. She undertakes that the boy shall not be injured either by *ἐπηλυσίη* or by—shall we say? —*ὑπότμησις*, these terms constituting a sort of rough dichotomy of all youthful ailments in their origin. Of course, it follows that there can be no limitation of *ὑπότμησις* to either worms or tooth-ache or both, as has been supposed (*v.* Allen and Sikes).

'*Ἐπηλυσίη*' is 'witch-craft,' or here that particular form of witch-craft which in medical phrase belongs to the aetiology of those maladies or *visitations* which often prove fatal suddenly or within a limited period, e.g. convulsions in childhood and fevers, etc., in boyhood. If so, and the categories are to be exhaustive, *ὑπότμησις* must be taken

to refer to disorders of a protracted character, slow in operation, though ultimately fatal, in youth and boyhood as well as infancy, e.g. improper feeding resulting in inanition and the scourge of consumption. Is *ὑπότμησις*, 'gradual cutting away,' the American 'whittling,' an appropriate term for a magic that would be likely to produce these results? Most certainly. We all know of the witches' waxen images of their victims gradually melted before the fire, cf. Vergil and Theocritus. In earlier days wooden ones doubtless served the same purpose, and we may learn from the story of Althaea and Meleager that the likeness in such cases need not be very exact. Many people to this day will sit and discern faces in the fire. I have myself—and who has not?—tried the experiment, with indifferent success I admit. Perhaps a log-fire is better than a coal-fire for the purpose. Althaea was more successful and saw the burning brand with some likeness to her baby. She extinguished it, and if any resemblance was left Meleager must have been a bit of a golliwog. Afterwards in her anger she threw the brand into the fire and by so doing killed her own son. Now if she had had recourse to *ὑπότμησις*, there would probably have been no tragedy, for after causing Meleager a twinge or two of severe tooth-ache (v. Allen and Sikes), either she might have repented and stayed her hand, or he might himself have induced some wise old woman who knew

ἀντίτομον μέγα φέρτερον ὑλοτόμοιο.

to commence operations and prevent further mischief.

I will now write down the passage with necessary corrections:

παιδά δέ τοι πρόφρασσ' *ὑποδέξομαι*, ὡς
με κελεύεις,
θρεψέμεν· οὐ ἐ, ἔολπα, κακοφραδίησι
τιθήνης
οὐ τις ἐπηλυσίη δηλήσεται οὐθ' *ὑποτάμνων*.
οἴδα γὰρ *ἀντίτομον μέγα φέρτερον ὑλοτόμοιο*,
οἴδα δ' ἐπηλυσίης πολυπήμονος ἐσθλὸν
ἀρυσμόν.

For *πρόφρασσα* instead of *πρόφρων* v. *Homeric* v. 359; for *θρεψέμεν* v. *Class. Rev.*, November, 1896, reading Mr. Allen for Mr. Monro, as in every reference there to the Hymns and their readings. No one would wish to retain *κοῦ* *pace* Allen and Sikes. The changes in 228 require a word of defence. *Τποταμνον* however accented would be an extraordinary noun to keep company with *ἀντίτομον* and *ὑλοταμον*. The simplification brought about by regarding it as a wrong transliteration of the present participle *ὑποτάμνων*—the two are identical in the early alphabet—is so great that we may easily be reconciled to reading *οὐ τις* for *οὐτ' ἄρ'*, especially when we note that the MS. does not read the nominative *ἐπηλυσίη*, but something that looks exceedingly like a dative *ἐπηλυσίησι*. Again, *ἐπηλυσίη* and *ὑπότμησις* are not processes that work of themselves. They are the means employed by the wicked witch or wizard, who has to use them to effect the desired ends. In prose the line might be expressed thus: *οὐτις οὐτε ἐπηλυσίη οὐτε ὑπότμησει χρώμενος*.

The suggestion of *ἀρυσμόν* for *ἐρυσμόν*, i.e. *Ερυσμόν* (*ἡν* *ἐρυσμόν* would be metrically correct), depends on this consideration, that the maladies, whatever they may be, are not prevented or forestalled in either case, but cured by counter-magic. We have the chiastic arrangement—

ἐπηλυσίη *ἀντίτομον* *ὑπότμησις = ὑλότομον* *ἀρυσμός*

The 'bewitching' is cured by 'drawing it off' not kept away by erecting a bulwark (*ἐρυμα*) against its assault. With regard to *ἀντίτομον* 'counter-cutting,' this need not be supposed to involve another image to be carved in any way, but merely as in later times (cf. *Aesc. Ag.* 17) the chopping of herbs to make a healing potion. The translation would be to this effect:

'Your child I will willingly undertake to bring up as you bid me. No one, I am sure, shall through his nurse's carelessness mar his life by witchery or image-whittling: for I know a contrary cutting far more effective than wood-chipping, and I know a good way to draw off the many pangs of bewitching.'

H. Dem. 240:

λάθρα φίλων γονέων· τοῖς δὲ μέγα
θαῦμ' ἔτέτυκτο—

In this line attention seems to have been directed solely upon λάθρα for λάθρη, but it shows two other defects more or less serious: γονέων for the epic τοκήων (*τοκέων* Ο 660, Φ 587 is a questionable form) is not likely to be right. Even in the one passage that can be adduced from the early epic to support the word at all (*Hesiod* 235, γονεῶν) there is good support for the variant τοκεῖσι. Secondly τοῖς for τοῖσι is, as I have shown elsewhere, a point not to be lightly dismissed.

Δάθρη ἔῶν (Spitzner, Abel) and κρύβδα φίλων (Baumeister) are only partial solutions, though if γονέων were dismissed, as I fear it would have to be, it would be possible to make a tolerable continuation of either, thus :

τοῖσιν δὲ μάλα μέγα θαῦμ' ἔτέτυκτο—.

At the same time I cannot bring myself to regard this as the true solution. The secrecy of Demeter's action was not limited to the parents of Demophon. I would therefore isolate λάθρη, as in δ 92, ρ 43, to give it a wider application :

νύκτας δὲ κρύπτεσκε πυρὸς μένει ἡύτε
δαλὸν
λάθρη· <ἄφαρ δέ> γονεῦσι τόδε μέγα
θαῦμ' ἔτέτυκτο
ώς προθαλῆς τελέθεσκε θεοῖσι δὲ πάντα
ἔώκει.
καὶ κέν μιν ποίησεν ἀγήραον ἀθάνατον τε,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ἀφραδίστων ἐνέζωνος Μετάνειρα
νύκτ' ἔπι τηρήσασα θυώδεος ἐκ θαλάμου
σκέψατο· κώκυσεν δὲ καὶ ἄμφω πλήξατο
μηρὼ
παιδὶ περιδείσασα—.

Between λάθρη and γονεῦσι (*τοκεῖσι?*) I have provisionally inserted ἄφαρ δέ but καὶ δέ (M 272, η 213) or καὶ ρά might be preferred. In 241 πάντα is a metrical correction of ἄντα, and in every way better than δέ τ' ἄντα (Gemoll). 'Αγήραον (242) is the true reading for ἀγήρων τ' which has the support of a black brother, needlessly black (*H. Aphi.* 214), and the blessing of Allen and Sikes. For νύκτ' ἔπι cf. Θ 529, but for the restoration of the

badly dislocated δείσασ' φ περὶ παιδὶ no apology seems necessary.

H. Dem. 248:

τέκνον Δημοφόων, ξείνη σε πυρὶ ἐνι
πολλῷ
κρύπτει, ἐμοὶ δὲ γόνον καὶ κήδεα λυγρὰ
τίθησιν.

This delusion of the learned that the fifth foot in l. 248 is a legitimate dactyl, a fading delusion, v. *Homeric* λ 26 ff., receives, as might be expected, the most unqualified support from Messrs. Allen and Sikes. The warning given by the trochaic caesura in the fourth foot avails nothing. They defend the quantity of the *i* in πυρὶ with the usual reference to 99, where, as I have said, Porson might have taught them better, and to 101

γρηὶ παλαιγενέΐ ἐναλίγκιος

a very bad misreading of the codex παλαιγενέν of which no mention is made in their Critical Notes, though it presents the true reading almost exactly with only a missing apostrophe :

γρηὶ παλαιγενέΐ ἦν ἀλίγκιος.

Place a full stop at the end of l. 100 and the certainty of this correction is patent.

In spite, then, of the dogmatic prohibition of these two editors 'No emendation is necessary,' I proceed to emend, I hope successfully, the debased tradition :

τέκνον Δημοφόων, ξείνη σε πυρ' εἰσ' ἐνι
πολλῷ
κρύπτει, ἐμοὶ δὲ γόνον καὶ κήδεα κ.τ.λ.

This deviates less from the transmitted line than either Hermann's or Voss's or Schneidewin's or Buecheler's suggested readings and can hardly be objected to on palaeographic grounds. It gets rid of the objectionable caesura in the fourth foot which Schneidewin's emendation, adopted by Abel, alone maintains; and it expresses the plain meaning in an undeniably idiomatic form, ἐνέίσα πυρὶ πολλῷ, cf. K 89 Ζεὺς ἐνέκε πόνοισι, l. 700, v 387 μένος πολυθαρτὲς ἐνέίσα. Lastly the legitimately reduced εἰσ' for εἰσα would be easily lost after πυρὶ owing to the later view of the elision of the *i* (*Homeric*, p. ix).

H. Herm. 132:

ἡδεῖ ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὡς οἱ ἐπειθέτο θυμὸς
ἀγήνωρ,
καὶ τε μάλισται ἰμείροντι τπερῆντι ιερῆς κατὰ
δειρῆς.

In 132 M ἐπειθέτο is very near indeed to the original reading ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὡς F' ἐπεπειθέτο, or as the archetype would have it ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὡς οἱ ἐπειθέτο without elision. Here the tradition could not preserve the true reading, as an error in scansion enabled it to do in 136, ὡς ἔφατ' αὐτάρ οἱ αὐτίς ἐγώ—. Most modern editors, recognising that αὐτάρ οἱ was no dactyl, have adopted ὡς φατ', αὐτάρ οἱ αὐτίς, which involves a new blunder. The tradition scans perfectly

ὡς ἔφατ' αὐτάρ F' αὐτίς ἐγώ—.

In 133 I cannot admit that Professor Tucker has solved the difficulty of περῆν by his suggestion of παρεῖν, anticipated apparently by Mr. Allen, and finally introduced into the text, *Homeri Cp.* vol. v. of the *Bibliotheca Oxoniensis*. The elision of the -au of είναι is absolutely inadmissible. The early epic affords no support to this novelty. Monro (*H.G.* § 376) rightly denies the possibility. No one would venture είν' for είναι, esse. Nor would στῆν', θεῖν' and δοῦν' for στήναι, θεῖναι,

δοῦναι be welcomed by the learned any more than ιστάν', τιθέν' and διδόν' for ιστάναι, τιθέναι and διδόναι.

The line is really suffering from the intrusion of a word that is as much out of place as needless. I would suggest

καίτε μάλισται ἰμείροντι παρεῖναι ἦς κατὰ
δειρῆς.

Some wooden ritualist among the later Greeks would think he was mending a deplorable hiatus and doing honour to Hermes by turning ης into ιερῆς though he left the verb to struggle for existence and to become περην', περῆν and πέρην.

The hymn-writer was more inclined to dwell on the unmitigated rascality than the holiness of his little Puck. 'Down his throat' is sufficient; 'down his holy throat' can only be described by the Hibernian term 'blatherskite.'

For σήμα νέντι φονῆς in 136 I suggest
σήματ' ἄφωνα φονῆς

'voiceless tokens of his ox-killing.' The corruption would be due to lipography. The δημὸν καὶ κρέα πολλὰ (135) are plain indications that the cattle have been slaughtered (φονῆς), they do not and can not prove that they have been stolen (φωρῆς).

T. L. AGAR.

THE HYPERBOREANS.

THE interpretation of the Hyperboreans as the 'bringers of the cult offerings' from the Far North to Delos was welcomed by many scholars, who saw in it an important confirmation of the tradition of the Hyperborean Apollo and the connection of his cult with Delos. Dr. Farnell¹ speaks of this etymology, first suggested by Ahrens, as by far the most interesting contribution made by philology to the study of Greek religion. More recent discussion, however, has shown defects in this extremely attractive derivation that render it untenable. Daebritz² (see also Jebb, *Bacchylides*, p. 460), follow-

ing Schroeder, has pointed to the fact that the preposition ὑπέρ is not found in this meaning of transmission, παρά being used in such compounds. He further shows that the name of the Macedonian month Τπερβερεταῖος, which plays a large part in this interpretation, refers to Zeus Hyperberetaeos, i.e. the Exalted, and has no reference to the transmission of offerings in this month. He adduces³ the name of Hermes Περφεραῖος in the Thracian Ainos, evidently meaning the Mighty or Exalted, as against the understanding of the word Περφερέες, used by Herodotus,³ in the sense of Bringers.

¹ *Greek Cults*, IV. 103.

² P. W. under Hyperborean.

³ IV. 38.

The word in the Herodotean passage in question is explained by the following *τημὰς μεγάλας—έχοντες.*

Schroeder, whom Daebritz and Kiessling follow, derives the word from 'bora' (Slavic 'gora') mountain, and the first two of these scholars give the preposition in Hyperborean the meaning of above, not beyond, and hold that the Hyperboreans were thought of as living above the Bora, or Balkans, in a life of happiness with their god Apollo. Kiessling,¹ on the other hand, emphasises the fact that from the beginning of the fifth century the popular etymology in Greece for the word was 'behind the North Wind,' and that already in the sixth the Hyperboreans were regarded as inhabitants of the Farthest North.

He says that while there may have existed in primeval times a belief that the souls of the blessed lived in a heaven high above the mountains with their god Apollo, yet the modern, and, as he believes, correct, derivation of the word from 'bora' ('gora') mountain was entirely unknown to the Greeks of historic times.

Following the 'bora' etymology I wish to propose an interpretation which I believe is more in accord with the development of trading and religious relations than the one advocated by Schroeder.

The word 'Bora' on which Schroeder's etymology rests occurs only in Livy XLV. 29, in the passage in which he describes the Roman division of Macedonia. It is there given as the name of the mountain dividing the district which had Pella for its chief city from the fourth district with Pelagonia for its *caput regionis*. This district is 'regio trans Boram montem, una parte confinis Illyrico, altera Epiro.' Its chief city, according to Livy, was Pelagonia, formerly a name given to the whole district. This place was called by the Greeks Heracleia Lyncestis, the modern Monastir, always a place of the greatest importance from a military and commercial point of view. It is the second town in importance in Macedonia to-day, and was the twelfth

(or eleventh) station from Dyrrachium on the famous Via Egnatia, which has been well described² as the expression of Rome's *Drang nach Osten*. The modern bishopric still preserves the name Pelagonia. In the *Iliad* xxi. 141 and 159, the eponym of the land, Pelagon, appears as the father of the Paonian prince Asteropaeus and as the son of the river Axius. Livy, in XXXI. 34, speaks of the *fauces Pelagoniae* as a crucial position from a military standpoint. On the southern slopes of the mountain range, called Bora by Livy, usually called Bermios, or Bernion, were the wonderful rose-gardens of Midas, and from this fertile and metaliferous region, known as Pieria, many myths drifted down to Greece. Among the most famous of these was that of the Pierian nymphs, whose home country reached back even to the 'snowy Paeonians' (Ov. *Met.* V. 313).

The Roman road must have coincided in great part with that of the northern bronze-using area, described by Wace and Thompson in *Prehistoric Thessaly* as 'extending westward from Troy through Servia into Europe and almost certainly from Troy into Anatolia.' This Roman road is described in the Antonine Itinerary as 'iter a Dyrrachio per Macedoniam et Thraciam Byzantium usque.' It passed through Pannonia, Moesia, and Thrace into Asia Minor. It may well have been by this way that amber and tin were brought to the dwellers in the northern area of civilisation, in which the art of metal-work flourished, 'while Thessaly was still in a neolithic or sub-neolithic age.'³ The Baltic amber trade followed the route to Adria at the head of the Adriatic. Pliny (*N.H.* XXXVII. 45) tells of a Roman knight of the time of the Emperor Nero who brought an enormous quantity of amber to Rome across Germany and Pannonia. In the well-known passage of the fourth book in which Herodotus describes the route by which the sacred offerings came to Delos from the North, he says that they came to the Adriatic, and were received

² Newbiggin, *Geographical Aspects of Balkan Problems*, p. 90.

³ Wace and Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 323.

¹ P. W. under *πιπάρα θρηνη*.

by the Hellenes of Dodona before any others in Greece, and then by way of the Malian gulf were carried on to Euboea and finally reached Delos. He testifies from personal knowledge (*οἶδα αὐτός*) that Paeonian and Thracian women used the same offerings in the cult of Artemis the Queen.

From all this I argue that the myth of the Hyperboreans grew up in Paeonia, on the Pierian side of Bora-Bermios, 'der heilige Berg,' as Crusius calls it, 'to which the gifts were carried.'¹ I have in previous discussions written of various aspects of the Pierian influence on the religion and legend of southern Greece, more especially the Sun and Moon worship. The worship of the Sun god is well established for all this region, and it was inevitable that the cult of Apollo should spread all along the North-Western trade-route. That the lands beyond the Bora into which the god disappeared every evening, from which the offerings came, on their way to the island home of Apollo in the far Aegean, should be developed in the imagination of the Paeonian Sun worshippers into a sort of paradise was a natural and indeed inevitable result, analogies for which will occur to every one. Olympus, Pieria, El Dorado, are a few among many such. Arcadia has had similar fortunes. We do not misunderstand Schiller when he writes—

Auch ich war in Arkadien geboren,
though we know the precise geographical position of Arcadia and also that it is far from Marbach.

No knowledge of the amber route, or of the Hyperboreans, appears in Homer, although he knows the Paeonians and their descent from Pelagon and the Axios river well. In his *Abii*, the most righteous of men, who live beyond the close-fighting Mysians and in the Danube region, we have his idealisation of a people to the North-West who remind us of the Hyperborean piety. There is but little of the distinctive religion of the Balkans in the *Iliad*. Paean, the Paeonian god of healing, is for Homer the attendant physician of the Olympian gods, and Apollo does

¹ He derived *βέρμιος* from *φέρω*. This I do not approve.

not appear clearly as the Sun god. There is an Elektor Hyperion, whose names suggest *elektron*, amber, and possibly the god *from beyond* (not, of course, from *ἴειν*), but these epithets are still dark in meaning. In any case, Helios-Paean-Apollo was the Sun god worshipped with Artemis Basileia in Paeonia-Pieria, and the Hyperborean legend connects this worship with the cult of Apollo and Artemis beyond the Bora. The names of the Hyperborean maidens sent with the offerings to Delos, Arge, Opis, Hyperoche, are moon-epithets,² and the hymns sung to their honours paid them by women are significant of the worship of that ancient goddess of women's life, the moon.

According to Schroeder and Daebritz the belief in the Hyperboreans must have been pre-Hellenic. In this I concur, but that 'hoch über den Wolkbergen, über dem thrakischen Gebirge lag das selige Land der Thraker,' etc., is not to my mind an interpretation that can be maintained. I know of no evidence for the belief in a paradise above the clouds among the Thracians. Rather I would say that the same gift of poetic imagination to which we owe the myth of the sisters of Phaethon, transformed into poplars and dropping tears of amber at the place which appears to have been an entrepôt³ for amber in ancient days, has also developed this legend of a holy race of men living beyond the Bora, on the North-Western track that led to the night home of the Sun god. The traces of the cult of the Sun god are frequent enough in all this region from Dyrrachium and Apollonia in both directions, and in Macedonia all along the stations of the Via Egnatia. M. Svoronos, in his recent study of the numismatic of Macedonia, has pointed to the constantly recurring symbol of the Paeonian Sun god on the coinage. A further recognition of the importance of the Sun and Moon cult in the Balkans for the study of Greek religion is to be desired.

² Cf. Crusius in Roscher's *Lexikon* under Hyperborean.

³ See A. J. Evans in his Freeman's *Sicily*, IV, 220, 221.

Herodotus says of the Bora that it is ἀβατον ὑπὸ χειμῶνος. From the sheltered land of rose-gardens and plenty at its Pierian foot arose the tales destined to appeal so strongly to the imagination of Greek poets, of the people over the Bora, to the North-

West, whom the Greeks later called Hyperboreans, and fancied that they lived beyond the North wind.

GRACE HARRIET MACURDY.

Vassar College,
Poughkeepsie, New York.

SOME NOTES ON ARISTOPHANES.

Ach. 220:

νῦν δ' ἐπειδὴ στερρὸν ἥδη τούμὸν ἀντικνήμιον,
καὶ παλαιῷ Λακρατείδῃ τὸ σκέλος
βαρύνεται,
οἴχεται.

THE scholia speak of a certain old Lacratides, who is said to have been an archon in the time of the Persian war: this must doubtless be nonsense. But it seems to me that van Leeuwen likewise errs, when he notes: 'senex Lacratides, qui nominatim a coryphaeo nunc designatur, unus est e choreutis.' On the contrary: it is a human trait that he who speaks boastfully or in a lamenting voice calls himself by his proper name instead of using the normal 'I': so does—to quote some examples out of many—the boastful Zeus (*Il.* viii. 22, 470); so does Hector (*Il.* vii. 75, xvi. 833); and so also does Oceanus in Aeschylus (*Prom.* 296), or Oedipus in Sophocles (*O.C.* 626), or Hector in Euripides (*Rhes.* 818).

Also in the verse under consideration it stands to reason that the *coryphaeus* himself is called Lacratides, and not until we assume this do the words get their true force:

καὶ παλαιῷ Λακρατείδῃ τὸ σκέλος
βαρύνεται.

(A similar thought is expressed by the chorus of old men, Eur. *Heracl.* 119 μὴ προκάμψῃ τόδα βαρύ τε / κῶλον.)

That in Aristophanes this mode of expression is of rather frequent occurrence may appear from places such as *Ach.* 1028: ἀλλ' εἰ τι κῆδε Δερκέτου Φυλασίου (where the lamenting farmer is of course named Derketes himself), *Eq.* 1309 οὐδὲ Ναυφάντης γε τῆς Ναύσων, *Lys.* 365 ἄγαι μόνον Στρατυλλίδος

τῷ δακτύλῳ προσελθών, *Thesm.* 77 εἰτ'
ἔστ' ἔτι ζῶν εἰτ' ἀπόλωλ' Εύριπίδης.

Ach. 435:

ὁ Ζεῦ διόπτα καὶ κατόπτα πανταχῷ.

Van Leeuwen hesitatingly proposes to read πάντ' ἔχω, expunging verse 436, which conjecture few will adopt. But, though it may be hypercritical to call πανταχῷ into question because strictly speaking κατόπτα presupposes a seeing in a definite direction, still there remains a difficulty in this verse. For a Ζεῦ κατόπτα, a Zeus, who looks down upon the earth, is normal: one need only think of the Homeric Zeus, who from the top of Gargaros surveys the battle-field; the idea of a Ζεῦ διόπτα on the other hand is only called up—and only in this connection—by the combination with a Ζεῦ κατόπτα. If this reasoning is right διόπτα and κατόπτα must be shifted and we have to read:

ὁ Ζεῦ κατόπτα καὶ—διόπτα πανταχῷ;

in the second part of this verse Dicaeopolis then holds the torn mantle towards the light.

διόπτα πανταχῷ is of course quite an intelligible combination; if necessary, cf. *Vesp.* 246 πανταχῷ διασκοπῶμεν, *Thesm.* 660 διασκοπεῖν—πανταχῷ.

Eq. 526:

εἴτα Κρατίνου μεμνημένος, δος πολλῷ
ρέύσας ποτ' ἐπαίνῳ
διὰ τῶν ἀφελῶν πεδίων ἔρρει, καὶ τῆς
στάσεως παρασύρων κτέ.

That ρέύσας is corrupted is admitted by everyone: neither is ρέύσας Attic, nor do we expect here ρέύσας instead of ρέων, nor is the combination ρέύσας—ἔρρει in accordance with Aristophanes' elegance.

I would read here: πολλῷ <π> ρήσας ποτ' ἐπαίνῳ.

Undoubtedly is this Homeric verb preferably used with reference to the wind and therefore the image would not be kept intact here; but it is notorious that in Greek poetry (as in that of other nations) a good deal of liberty is allowed in such cases. Take e.g. *Ag.* 79:

φυλλάδος ἥδη
κατακαρφομένης τρίποδας μὲν ὄδοις
στείχει:

there the withering tree becomes, as the sentence proceeds, a doubled up old man.

Pax 686:

ἀπορῶν ὁ δῆμος ἐπιτρόπου καὶ γυμνὸς ὡν
τοῦτον τέως τὸν ἄνδρα περιεξώσατο.

The best illustration of this passage is found *Herodas* II. 15:

στ] εὐώς ἐ[γ]ὼ τῷ προστάτ[η]
τ] εθώρ[η]γματ,

from which it appears at the same time that the reading *τεθώρηγματ* is preferable to Bücheler's *δεδώρηματ*.

Ran. 238:

έγὼ δὲ φλυκταίνας γ' ἔχω,
χώ πρωκτός ἴδει πάλαι,
κατ' αὐτίκ' ἐγκύψας ἐρεῖ
βρεκεκεκεξ κοάξ κοάξ.

The true reading *ἐκκύψας* is found in the papyrus-fragment published by Schubart and v. Wilamowitz (*Berliner Klassikertexte* v. 2, p. 105): as long as Dionysus keeps *sitting* on the rowing-bench, *ἐγκύψας* is the fit word; but when he lifts his *πρωκτός*, then the participle *ἐκκύψας* suits the meaning.

P. GROENEBOOM.

Groningen, Holland.

THE DOMINION OF PELEUS.

DR. LEAF'S view, in *Homer and History*, of a difference between 'Homer' and the 'Cataloguer' in regard to Peleus' realm depends very largely on the ownership of Iolcus. The Cataloguer gives the town to Eumelus. Dr. Leaf thinks (p. 115f.) that it is 'clear enough' that, according to 'Homer', Iolcus belonged to Peleus. This is 'recorded ineffaceably in the name of Mount Pelion,' below the peak of which Iolcus lay, and in the stories connecting the mountain with Peleus' family. Then there is the Pelian spear, which Cheiron gave Peleus, 'of course in token of vassalage.' And lastly, 'the Achilles who was educated on Pelion of course had his home at its foot, and not far away at the head of the Malian Gulf.'

As regards the names Peleus and Pelion, the connection is assumed, but it has never been proved. The terminations of the words are against the derivation of the one from the other. But even connection is disputed. In Roscher, s.v. Peleus, the discussion is poor. Eustathius' view that Peleus is

the *Heros Eponymos* is adopted, and reference is made to H. D. Müller (1857) and Mannhardt, the latter of whom seems to be doubtful. Fick (*Ortsnamen*, 77, and *Personennamen*, 431) is against the notion. 'Πάλιον, das natürlich mit Πηλεύς nichts zu tun hat, wird "Lehmberg" sein, zu πηλός (ā).' Πηλεύς he takes to be for a full form with πηλε- for τηλε-, comparing Τηλέμαχος. Gruppe (*Griech. Mythol.* 618n.) quotes a name Πηλεκλέας, though (1141n.) he prefers, as others do, the derivation from πάλλω. Others, again, have referred Πηλεύς to πηλός, in confirmation of the aqueous origin of Achilles. All seems uncertain. The origin and connections of the two names have still to be settled, and no argument can be based on their identity. Compare the note on p. 288 of Mr. Chadwick's *Heroic Age*.

The Pelian spears helps as little. What ground is there for saying that of course it was given in vassalage? Has the gift of a spear ever had this significance? When the late Dr. Verrall startled the Homeric world a few years

ago by propounding a 'Mutiny of Idomeneus'—a hero who was supposed to have broken a spear by way of renouncing his fealty—careful enquiry failed to elicit that a spear had ever been put to such a use. Andrew Lang, who was greatly interested in the Mutiny, found the idea entirely new. Moreover, in the literature of the Peleus-Pelion connection, which may all be found referred to in the relevant articles in Roscher and Pauly-Wissowa, in Meyer's *Achilleis* and in *Hermes*, xxx. 73ff., there is never a hint that the spear was more than a wedding present on the occasion of the bridal of Peleus and Thetis. Poseidon at the same time gave the immortal horses, other gods a suit of mail, *καὶ λοιποὶ ἔτερα*. Homer simply mentions the gift, but his language (*μελίνη* and *Πηλίον ἐκ κορυφῆς*) hardly implies more than that the Centaur supplied a good ashen shaft, which, according to some accounts, Athéné and Hephaestus converted into a spear. It would be quite in the Homeric way to use a phrase—*χαριζόμενος βασιλῆς*, or the like—to indicate that the spear was a feudal gift, but what the poet says on the subject is very different,—*φόνον ἔμεναι ἡρώεσσιν*. Mr. Paton thinks it was one of three enchanted gifts which made Achilles such a valuable ally (*C.R.* xxvi. 1ff.), and that consists with the view that the Myrmidon was simply a great warrior, and could not compete as a sovereign with Agamemnon and others. With no suggestion in the tradition, and no instances produced *aliunde*, it is surely not justifiable to assume as a matter of course a symbolical presentation to a feudal superior.

On the third point, it is again remarkable that in the literature above referred to Iolcus is regarded as distinct from Phthia. The persons concerned go from Phthia to Iolcus, and from Iolcus back to Phthia. And surely one is not justified in saying that, because Achilles was brought up on Pelion, he *of course* had his home at its foot. No one knows in what town Peleus and Achilles dwelt, unless (as some have thought, not without reason, from the terms of *Il.* ii. 682f.) Phthia was a town. But Peleus might well have sent his son a distance of fifty miles or so from

the Spercheus valley to be under the care of his grandfather, the 'most righteous of the Centaurs.' Other fathers did so, for legend gave Cheiron many hero-pupils. But after all Homer does not say Achilles was educated by Cheiron on Pelion. That would be an extreme inference from *Il.* xi. 830ff. And there is Phoenix, as the scholiasts remarked, to be reckoned with as rival educator.

Dr. Leaf has yet another argument about the extent of the realm of Peleus. On p. 112 he says we cannot doubt that the Phthia of Homer was the later Phthiotis. It would thus extend 'to the very head of the Pagasean Gulf,' and include Iolcus. But that again is a very large assumption, and quite opposed to his own former view in *Troy*, 347. There he did not discuss the 'difficult question' of Phthia, but he did say 'in any case it cannot have been identical with the Phthiotis of later history.' That is quite enough to give us pause in regard to the present statement. What Homer meant by Phthia has still to be ascertained.

Finally, it is asserted on the following grounds that Pherae, a little to the west of Iolcus, is given to Peleus by Homer. First, the chief who held Iolcus must hold Pherae also. But it has been seen above that there is no reason to believe that Peleus owned Iolcus. Secondly, there is the interpretation, popular in antiquity, of Hector's parting words to Andromaché (*Il.* ii. 456f.), *καὶ κεν ἐν Αργει ἑοῦσα πρὸς ἄλλης ιστὸν ὑφαῖνοις, καὶ κεν ὑδωρ φορέοις Μεσσηΐδος ή Τπερέης*. As there were springs of these names at Therapné in Laconia and in Thessaly respectively, the lines were taken as meaning that Andromaché is to be the slave of either Menelaus or Achilles. Now Dr. Leaf shows that Pindar and Sophocles know a famous spring Hypereia, which is at Pherae, and the locality of which is known to their hearers by the mere name. Homer knows it too, so it must be the same one, and 'Hector' contemplates that Andromaché will be carried off to Pherae.' On this it is held to be 'hardly disputable' that Pherae was in the realm of Achilles. But only if the interpretation of the men of old was correct. That,

however, was a mere guess which all authorities do not accept. It may be suggested that the indication to Andromaché of the individual master she will have to serve is an extreme touch that would spoil an exquisite scene. Also, the ascription to Hector of such a minute knowledge of localities in Greece is unlikely (Monro, *a.l.*). The better view has been held that the poet is merely mentioning two well-known springs in Greece without further suggestion. And there is the possibility, which must have occurred to many who have considered the passage, that the words Μεσσηνὶς and

Tηρεπεῖην, each obviously derived from a word signifying position, are not proper names at all, but mean 'the middle or upper well,' as Mr. Allen translates in *C.Q.* iii. 94. But, be that as it may, it is clear there is no good ground for giving Pherae to Achilles and Peleus, if we do not give them Iolcus.

On the whole, it does not appear that any valid reason has been adduced for the view that 'Homer' assigned to Peleus a spacious realm which a reckless 'Cataloguer' afterwards split up into a number of domains.

A. SHEWAN.

SOME CRUCES IN CATULLUS RECONSIDERED.

Catullus I. 8-10:

quare tibi habe quicquid haec libelli
al. mei G
 qualecumque quod patrona virgo
 plus uno maneat perenne saeculo

I assume *hoc* for *haec* in the first line, and the last line may be called certain; the rest remains in dispute, because the conjecture commonly admitted in v. 8

quare habe tibi

suffers from incurable defects both in the inversion of the phrase *tibi habe* (pointed out by Baehrens), in the unapt associations of the phrase, and finally in point of metre; for the elision *quare habe* is as objectionable as that '*patronei ut ergo*' which Bergk wished to import into v. 9, and which Ellis on that ground rightly refused to admit into a finished ceremonious poem like this.

To these defects may be added the unsolved objections against 'epexegetic expansion' of *quicquid* by *qualecumque*. Friedrich's 'exact parallel' from Pliny does not satisfy me:

Quisquis ille, qualiscumque, sileatur.
(Epist. VIII. xxii. 4.)

Pliny means 'whatever be his name and whatever his behaviour, I mean to leave him anonymous.' But even if we were sure that no verb was there when the phrase was written (nothing easier than for an *est* to fall out before the *sileatur*), the elliptical familiarities of epistolary prose are not lightly to be presumed in a ceremonious poem.

Mr. Slater's hint that *quicquid habes* was a clue suggested to me a new line of inquiry, and led me to Propertius II. iv. 14:

sic est incertum, quicquid habetur, amor.

'Such an uncertainty is love, whatever you may make of it.' 'Quicquid habetur = quicquid est': a variation for metrical convenience. On the analogy of which phrase I conjecture that Catullus wrote:

quare, quicquid habetur hoc libelli,
 qualecumque . . .

This brings *quicquid hoc libelli* into shape, like

quodcumque hoc regni (*Aen.* i. 78)
 and *hoc aevi quodcunquest* (*Lucr.* ii. 15)

and leaves *quicquid* a verb to itself.¹ But at the same time it presupposes a further change in v. 9.

Editors have been unnecessarily sceptical about *patrona virgo*. There is ample warrant for calling a Muse *Virgo*.

Propertius II. xxx. 33:

nec tu *virginibus reverentia moveris ora :*
 hic quoque non nescit quid sit amare, chorus

and Val. Flacc. iii. 16:

Tu mihi nunc causas infandaque proelia, Clio,
 pande virum ; tibi enim superum data, Virgo,
 facultas . . .

¹ *Aen.* ix. 287, cited by Riese, is quite irrelevant.

Also, besides its metrical roughness, there lies against Bergk's

patronei ut ergo

as defended by Munro (*Crit. and Eluc.* Ed. 2. pp. 3-5), a material objection. Munro argues from the poetry of Domitian's reign when Rome was far gone in flattery, and from two particularly obsequious poets, Martial and Statius, in support of something which was quite foreign to the last age of the Republic: viz. the idea that the immortality of a work—not its immediate reception, but its *immortality*—depended on its patron's merit. Even Munro's Flavian instances do not fully fit the case; but the very different manner of 130 to 150 years earlier may be exemplified from Lucretius and from the author of *Ciris* (whom I take to be Cornelius Gallus—anyhow a contemporary of his).

Lucretius I. 24-28, after the invocation of Venus has been developed for a score of verses, concludes thus:

te sociam studeo scribendis versibus esse,
quos ego de rerum natura pangere conor
Memmiadae nostro, quem tu, dea, tempore in
omni
omnibus ornatum voluisti excellere rebus.
Quo magis aeternum da dictis, diva, leporem.

If *quo magis* does mean 'all the more for Memmius' sake,' yet there is no hint that Lucretius imagined his work would gain eternity by being dedicated to Memmius. Only the Muses can give *leptorem*; and of them he begs this gift that his work may be worthy of Memmius, a man of so many graces.

Ciris 92-100:

The pedantic introduction to the poem, a Labyrinth of language, which has already included the dedication to Messala (v. 36), at last issues into an invocation to the Muses, of which the skeleton is:

quare divae
Pierides . . . nunc age, divae,
praecipue nostro nunc adspirate labori
atque hoc aeterno praetexite honore volumen.

Immortality, but not immortality for Messala's sake or to oblige Messala.

I do not doubt that Catullus followed the ordinary republican usage of first

making his complimentary dedication and then invoking his Muse to make the work immortal. Now the dedication is finished and complete with v. 7: the *namque* clause has explained why Catullus should choose Nepos, as distinctly as *Corneli, tibi* has stated the choice. Nepos is thus done with. So the conjecture *habe tibi*, although it has figured as a *lectio recepta* for so long in so many editions, is now found to be offensive in yet a third respect. For, far from being as Munro would have it, 'a violation of all art and good taste to turn so abruptly in the last two lines to the Muse . . . when Nepos has been the sole theme of the first eight verses and has been addressed throughout in the second person,' it is both regular and reasonable; whereas to say that his book's hope of immortality was for Nepos' sake must be either a piece of servility or of irony.

Remains to fill the hole in v. 9. Given the sentence

quare, quicquid habetur hoc libelli,
qualecumque . . . patrona virgo,
plus uno maneat perenne saeclo

what is there room for? I see nothing more likely than the traditional *quidem*, on which Munro fell back. I had thought of *volo* (like 'Torquatus volo parvulus dulce rideat' in LXI. 209—an 'optative formula,' as Ellis calls it); but the quantity of the -ō is a fatal objection. Catullus everywhere scans it (as doubtless everybody pronounced it) *volō*; so does Horace, in the one place where he uses it; Virgil avoids the word altogether; and Propertius has the final once short and once elided (which implies that it was short), never *volō*.

The sentence

Quare, quicquid habetur hoc libelli,
qualecumque quidem, patrona virgo,
plus uno maneat perenne saeclo

thus comes out perfectly normal, inasmuch as the *quicquid . . . libelli* has a verb, which it needs, and the *qualecumque* has none, needing none.

quicquid habetur hoc libelli = *hoc quodcumque est libelli*.

It is normal for the verb to follow immediately after *quicquid*.

But in conclusion I am bound to add this: the above reconstruction makes no use of the variant in G (*mei* for *libelli*) out of which Baehrens got his uncouth *mel*. Variants in G are not to be scorned. Is this one really a v. l. brought in by collation? If it be a *sine qua non* to a successful treatment of the passage to bring in this *mei*, I would venture the alternative

Quare, quicquid habetur, hoc libelli
qualecumque mei, patrona virgo,
plus uno maneat perenne saeclo.

But is *qualecumque* possible with a genitive? and can such a genitive consist with a possessive pronoun?

XLV. 8. and 17:

hoc ut dixit Amor {sinistra ut
{sinistravit
{sinistrante} ante.

Voss states that several MSS. read *sinistrante ante*, and to Voss belongs the credit of restoring *sinister ante*. Munro saw the correctness of *sinister*, but unnecessarily alter *ante* to *astans*. But neither Voss nor any other that I can find explains the *ante* properly.

In Virg. *Ecl.* ix. 15 Servius (Daniel) bids us interpret

ante sinistra cava monuisset ab ilice cornix
thus:

indivise legendum. Et dicendo 'monuisset'
oscinem fuisse demonstrat. Sane hoc ad augura-
lem pertinet disciplinam: augures enim designa-
nunt spatiis lituo et eis dant nomina, ut prima
pars dicatur antica, posterior postica, item
dextra et sinistra. Modo ergo cornicem de nulla
harum parte venisse dicit, sed ab antica ad
sinistram partem volasse, etc.

This does not mean that *antesinistra* must be written as one word: *indivisim* translates *ἴφεν*. Servius on *Aen.* i. 198

o socii nec enim ignari sumus ante malorum

says 'ἴφεν est, i.e. antiquorum malorum.' In both cases the meaning is that these words are to be construed together; *ante malorum* = *τῶν πρόσθεν κακῶν*; *ante sinistra* = 'left-forward.'

Just such is Cupid's position with regard to the lovers. *Ante sinister* or *sinister ante* is augural for N.W. when you are looking northwards. How suitable (nay, how necessary) to the grouping *sinister* is Munro's (verbal)

chart shows; but suppose Septimius to face N., then N.W. is evidently the perfect station for Cupid, since Acme will be facing W.N.W. or N.W.

I presume Ellis was right in taking Voss (whose note is obscure) to mean by his *sinister ante* 'qui antea sinister fuerat.' This interpretation will not do. There is nothing in the poem even to suggest a quarrel in the past, unless it be the *nunc* of v. 19; but this *nunc* merely means 'after this happy inauguration': *auspicatiorem* in v. 26 shows that *nunc* refers to a starting-point, not to a re-starting in another direction. This is Septimius' first love —all the diminutives (*Septimille . misellus . ocellos*) are applied to him; Acme is probably old enough to be his mother. But one may leave Friedrich (p. 69) to do justice to the point: 'Non cuivis Germano contigit adire Lutetiam.' But since Voss does not allude to the Eclogue passage, he can hardly have intended this rare though solidly attested (for Servius on augural matters deserves to be heard) usage of *ante sinister*.

The left-hand position merely gives validity to the omen of the sneeze, without determining its tendency; *dextram* declares it to be favourable, and *adprobationem* defines how: it is a divine ratification given to words which imply a 'So help me God!'

Palaeographically the case is singularly clear; a ditto graph explains all:

sinisterantante
sinisteraut ante
sinistrant ante;

out of which, at the first attempt to get beyond a *vox nihil*, is elicited

sinistravit ante
or
sinistra ut ante.

To complete the case, it will be as well to consider another passage where *sinister ante* occurs: the second Priapean in the *Catalepton*:

Ego haec ego arte fabricata rustica
ego arida, o viator, ecce populus
agellulum hunc t+sinistretant+ quem vides,
erique villulam hortulumque pauperis
tuor malaque furis arceo manu.

Birt (*Jugendverse u. Heimatpoesie Vergil's*, p. 27), on the strength of this

imitation or reminiscence, foists *sinistra et ante*, which Ribbeck read here, upon Catullus, at best a cumbersome and prosaic way of expressing *sinister ante*. The elision of a *ā* is even more unlikely in this poem than in the Septimius and Acme. Besides which *sinistrā* here is ambiguous: the viator faces the image; *sinistrā* could mean either Priapus' left

or the viator's. *Sinister* is definite 'Stand to the left of me,' says Priapus, 'and you will see the field in front of you.' There is no need here to construct *sinister ante īphēν*: *ante* is regularly adverbial to *vides*; '*ante vides = prospicis.*'

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

Glasgow.

MISUNDERSTANDINGS OF CAESAR AND HORACE.

1. Caesar, *de bello ciuili* 3. 83. 3 sq.:

Et L. Domitius in consilio dixit placere sibi bello confecto ternas tabellas dari ad iudicandum eis qui ordinis essent senatorii belloque una cum ipsis interfuerint sententiasque de singulis ferrent (ferri Paul) qui Romae remansissent quique intra praesidia Pompei fuissent neque operam in re militari praestitissent: unam fore tabulam qui liberandos omni periculo censerent, alteram qui capitis damnarent, tertiam qui pecunia multarent.

The current interpretation of the latter sentence is that adopted by Mr. Peskett in his annotated edition and in his Loeb translation 'one tablet, they said, would be for those who should decide that such persons should be exempted from all peril, the second for those who should condemn them to loss of civil status, the third for those who should mulct them in a fine.' It is not surprising that those who think that a relative ought to define an antecedent noun or pronoun, and not something outside the sentence, should have desiderated an ablative to refer to *tabellam*. But to change *qui* three times to *qua* is unmethodical. It is also unnecessary: for the ablative is there already. If it be deemed that Caesar himself would not have used this semi-fossilised form, for which see Neue-Wagener 2. pp. 455 sqq., it may be pointed out that Caesar is only quoting the words of a formal resolution, which may well have followed the well-known legal custom of using forms and phrases obsolete in ordinary speech, as in the *Lex agraria C.I.L. I. 200 § 17* we have *a quei (qui) = a quo*.

2. *Carminis fragmentum ap. Sueton. Vit. Terent. 5.*

unum hoc maceror ac doleo tibi desse, Terenti.

Landor, in his *Imaginary Conversations* (see *Classical Review*, vol. xxix.

(1915), p. 172), has criticised the expression of this line from Caesar's well-known judgment on the merits of Terence, putting in the mouth of Licinius Calvus the words 'Yes, I remember his opinion conveyed in verse, and principally for its too strong expression, *unum hoc maceror: doleo* is weak after this, and *doleo* is itself almost an exaggeration.'

The same misconception which led Landor to censure has led two English scholars (*Classical Review, l.c.*) to alter a perfectly irreproachable verse, and has thus furnished one more example of how little chance ancient utterances have when they are in discord with modern preoccupations. Once more we see that 'Our modern critics are unduly sensitive on the subject of unusual order, especially in verse;' once more 'the lineal habit of mind' shows itself 'at a loss when it has to understand the circular.' Resolute and constant effort alone will enable us to realise that in a Latin sentence, or a group of sentences which represent an integral unit of thought, mere precession or succession in the order of words was in itself immaterial, and if convenience or necessity demanded an unusual order, the Roman intelligence was swift to respond and understand. What it did and what we, too often, fail to do, may be shown by a parallel that is closer than might at first sight appear. A common exercise of ingenuity is the discovery of the original arrangement of the letters of a word when these have been shuffled. There is a quick and easy way to this: to place the constituent letters so that they are in a circle or similar figure. This is the way the ancient Romans regarded their sentences. There is also a slow, laborious

and uncertain way: to place the constituents in a row and consider them thus. This is how the modern mind proceeds. It would be waste of time to accumulate examples now. What is needed by offenders is not proof but observation. But I will give three so-called 'hystera protera' from among those which have lately come under my notice. Lucan 8. 322 sqq. 'quid enim tibi laetius umquam | praestiterint superi quam si ciuilia Partho | milite bella geras, tantam consumere gentem | et nostris miscere malis?' I take this because, though in strict order the action of *miscere* comes first, some overlapping of the two actions is quite conceivable. No such palliation can be traced in my second example: Ovid M. 8. 537 'dumque manet corpus, corpus refouentque fouentque,' an order of words as impossible for a Roman to misunderstand as it is for an Englishman to reproduce. My third illustration is from prose, and relates to succession in sentences or rather, seeing that the sentences are not independent in thought, in clauses: Tacitus *Agric.* 12 'solum praeter oleam uitemque et cetera calidioribus terris oriri sueta, frugum patiens [fecundum]; tarde mitescunt, cito proueniunt.' A comparison with *Agric.* 3 'ut corpora nostra lente augescunt, cito extinguentur, sic ingenia studiaque opresseris facilius quam reuocaueris' shows, what indeed the order of chiasmus might of itself have taught us, that in what was a whole to the Roman mind the observance of succession was discretionary.

To return to our passage, *maceror ac doleo* is conceptually, though not metrically, the exact equivalent of *doleo ac maceror*. And it has this advantage grammatically that the postponement of *doleo* provides an easy construction for the following infinitive. Its hasty removal leaves *maceror* to discharge a function, its capacity for which the removers have not even attempted to establish.

3. Horace, *Odes* 3. 27. 69 sqq.:

mox ubi lusit satis, 'Abstineto'
dixit 'irarum calidaeque rixae
cum tibi inuisus laceranda reddet
cornua taurus.

uxor inuicti Iouis esse nesci.
mitte singultus, bene ferre magnam
disce fortunam; tua sectus orbis
nomina ducet.'

The force of inertness is nowhere greater than in the interpretation of Horace, and nowhere therefore is it less easy to dislodge an accepted explanation, particularly if it have found its way into the grammars. The customary, though happily not the exclusive, explanation of l. 73 is 'You do not know (or do you not know) that you are the wife of unvanquished Juppiter.' This interpretation I have incidentally observed, e.g. in *Classical Review*, xviii. p. 453a, is inadmissible. But nothing short of a direct challenge will shock its adherents into defending it. It is to be scouted for the following reasons. First, the meaning it affords is out of place in the context. The question is not one of Europa's knowledge, or ignorance, but one of her behaviour. The verses before 73 tell Europa what she is to do when the Bull returns; the verses after it what she is to do now,¹ and verse 73 is designed to tell her that she is not doing what she should. Secondly, the construction assumed by the interpretation is destitute of all authority in Latin. I call upon its upholders to produce a single passage in which *nescio*, or *scio* either, is used as they suppose it to be used here. The sole sense of these verbs when followed by a subjectless infinitive, and the one that would at once occur to a reader is that of *knowing* or *not knowing how to do* anything. Is it necessary to prove this in the face of such well-known passages as Livy 9. 3. 12 'ea est Romana gens quae uicta quiescere nesciat,' 22. 51. 4 'vincere scis, Hannibal; uictoria uti nescis?' Or does the use of *esse* 'to behave, to comport oneself' present a difficulty? Then compare Lucan 9. 1037 sq. 'tutumque putauit | iam bonus esse socer' and, with our very verb *nescio*, Valerius Maximus 2. 6. 6 'abiigitur et esto seruus quoniam liber esse nescisti.' The only approximation to

¹ The difference in the tenses of *abstineto* and *mitte* seems to be generally neglected by the commentators beginning with Bentley.

a parallel is that adduced in Kiessling's note, where *nescius*, common with the infinitive in the sense of 'unable,' is alleged to be employed as *nescio* here, Prop. 4. 4. 68 'nescia, uae furiis accubuisse nouis'; but 'uae furiis' is merely a bad emendation of Jacob's, the MSS having *nefarioris*, long ago corrected to *se furoris*. Thirdly the interpretation cannot escape under the disguise of a

'Graecism.' Let me quote what I have said elsewhere, *i.e.* above, 'φησίν εἶναι justifies *ait esse* and the like. But οὐδα λέγειν is one thing and οὐδα λέγων another.' To which I need only add that the Latin for the first is *scio loqui* and for the second *scio me loqui*.

J. P. POSTGATE.

Liverpool.

VIRG. ECL. IV. 62.

I HAVE been puzzled by a passage in Professor Phillimore's article in the last number of the *C.R.*, p. 149, which runs as follows :

To begin with, the reading *qui non risere parentes* may be regarded as almost an acquired certainty; the notion that *videre*¹ with an accusative was at best archaic Latin, or vulgar Latin, may be finally dispelled by a comparison of certain passages which shall be considered further on.

Does Professor Phillimore mean, what he certainly seems to say, that some persons have denied that in good Latin *ridere* can govern an accusative? In the words of the immortal Mrs. Gamp, 'Who deniges of it, Betsey?' If such a person exists, let him straightway consult a dictionary. If that is not his meaning, what is it?

In the meantime it seems to me that there is a fatal objection to this reading, to wit that if Virgil wrote these words he was encouraging the baby boy to laugh at his mother—a technically 'impious' act. I do not know of any instance where *ridere* is used with the accusative in the sense of smiling approvingly or fondly on a person or thing: always, as far as I can find, it implies a sense of superiority in the laugher and inferiority in the person or thing laughed at, whether the laughter be contemptuous or good-natured. Let us test this by Virgil's own words. In *Ecl. vi. 23*, we have 'Ille dolum ridens cet.' where Silenus laughs in good-humoured toleration of his bonds. In *Aen. v. 181*,

¹ Thus the text, which—with apologies to those who believe in the inviolable sanctity of the written (and *a fortiori* of the printed) word—I venture to emend, conjecturally, to *ridere*.

Illum et labentem Teucri et risere natantem
Et salsos rident revomentem pectore fluctus,

a passage which needs no comment.

When, on the other hand, he wishes to convey the meaning of smiling approvingly, he uses the dative, of a person 'Risit pater optimus olli,' *Aen.* v. 358, of a thing 'Dolis risit Cytherea repertis,' *Aen.* iv. 128, as correctly explained by Dr. Henry (*Aeneidea*, vol. ii. p. 629).

When Professor Haverfield wrote in his edition of Conington (1898), 'It has usually been assumed that "risere" governs the dative "smiled on him," but there is no authority for such an use,' he must have forgotten these passages. Nor do those quoted by Professor Phillimore show any such use of *ridere* with an accusative as would justify a dutiful child in so acting towards his mother. *Dirae*, 108, is irrelevant, as the word there is not *ridet* but *arridet*, and surely Hor. *Od. I. x. 9-12* was cited by a slip of memory, the accusative being governed by *terret*, while *risit* simply means *laughed*. There remain

Rident vicini glebas et saxa moventem.
(Hor. *Ep. I. xiv. 39*)

Precisely: they laugh at you contemptuously, and you do not like it, and wish yourself back in town.

Ridetque benigne
Parthenope gentile sacrum nudosque viro-
rum
Certatus et parva suae simulacula coronae.
(Stat. *Silv. III. I. 151*)

Even so might an All England man have regarded the match between All Muggleton and Dingley Dell.

It follows then that until some in-

stances are produced to show that *ridere matrem* was an action which a 'pious' and well-conducted infant could permit himself, we are compelled to choose between the *cui non*

risere parentes of Conington, supported by the MSS., and the *qui non risere parenti* of Hirtzel, supported by the sense.

HERBERT W. GREENE.

NOTES

HORACE, OD. I. xxxiv.-xxxv.

FEW readers of Horace can have found the ode *parcus deorum cultor* satisfactory. 'I used,' says the poet, 'to be a wicked sceptic; but Iuppiter converted me by a miraculous thunder-clap, and now I am quite orthodox.' This is neither true nor good literary pretence, and no reason for so pretending can plausibly be given.

Horace's real views were and are public property. He was an eclectic (*Epp.* I. 14), an Academic if anything (*Epp.* II. ii. 45), in ethics chiefly Epicurean (*Epp.* I. iv. 16 and a score of other passages), though admiring Stoic morality, with reserves (*Sat.* II. iii. and *passim*). He did not believe in the miraculous (*Sat.* I. v. 97 sqq.), in immortality (*Od.* IV. vii.), nor in supernaturalism generally. On the other hand he had a decent respect for the State cult (*passim*), and a civilised contempt for magic, foreign cults (e.g. Judaism) and absurdities in private worship (*Sat.* II. iii. 288). In short, his ideas were simply those of the average educated Roman of that day. What he says might be paralleled from every other writer of the Golden Age, the Platonic and neo-Stoic leanings of Cicero, and the mysticism of Vergil alone forming partial exceptions. A comparison of his earlier and later writings shows no change.

It need hardly be pointed out nowadays that the contemporary religious revival, devoid as it necessarily was of all credal tests, would in no way affect his position. Nothing in his private views made him averse to seeing temples built and restored—probably, like Propertius, he derived artistic pleasure from them—and the moderation of his own life shows his exaggerated condemnation of contemporary and lauda-

tion of ancient morals not to have been wholly insincere. And as a poet he was free to have a literary belief in all manner of gods, as Lucretius before him or Claudian after him. Indeed, he found it rather amusing to play with the ancient beliefs and have his own little private cults of Faunus, Diana, and the local fountain-spirit.

What point is there, then, in this pretended conversion? If a hoax, it is a singularly poor one, and Horace does not generally write nonsense in Alcaics. I believe that the answer to the riddle is to be found in the concluding lines of xxxiv., with their mention of Fortune, and in the stately hymn to that deity which forms the next ode.

The vague belief in 'luck,' which derives from savage ideas of *mana*, *wakanda*, etc., is and always has been prominent in the popular mind, but has seldom engrossed such a share of serious thought as in the opening centuries of our era. Every philosopher wrote and lectured *περὶ τύχης*, as a glance through that invaluable scrap-book of first-century ideas, Plutarch's *Moralia*, clearly indicates.¹ Belief in a vague, ultra-human, irresponsible power, which on the whole rather favoured Rome, was wellnigh the sole article in the theology of the average educated man. To say 'I too have come to believe in such a power' was a perfectly reasonable statement for Horace to make.

I hold further that he does not pack this statement into two or three lines, but that the whole of the next Ode

¹ *περὶ τύχης*, *περὶ τῆς τῶν Ρωμαίων τύχης*, *περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδροῦ τύχης*, and scores of other passages in other essays. The ancient Antiate goddess of fertility had been transformed into a Tyche on Greek lines long before Horace wrote.

follows immediately on the last stanza of xxxiv., and should be printed as one with it. The contents of the entire poem I would summarise thus: 'Once I held that everything was governed by natural laws, but now I see that certain events proceed from no causes ascertainable by us, but appear like thunder without a thunder-cloud. Behind them lies that power, the Iuppiter of our fathers, which all the world venerates as Chance or Necessity. It can humble the proud and exalt the lowly, and only the loftiest virtue (*albo Fides velata panno*) can rise superior to it. May this power guard Caesar and save us from further evil strife.'

H. J. ROSE.

NOTE ON CATULLUS XVII.
17 FF.

I SHOULD punctuate this passage as follows:

*ludere hanc sinit ut libet, nec pili facit uni,
nec se sublevat ex sua parte ; sed velut alnus*

*in fossa Liguri iacet supernal securi,
tantumdem omnia sentiens quam si nulla sit
usquam,
talis iste meus stupor, etc.*

The construction is missed by the editors, who most of them make bad Latin and all of them make bad sense. It is *velut* followed by *talis*—a more or less obvious variant on *velut* or *veluti* followed by *sic*, for which compare Vergil, *Aen.* I. 148 ff. I take *alnus* as nominative to *iacet*, *nulla* as referring to *securi*. The passage would then signify: 'As an alder lies in a ditch, hamstrung by a Ligurian axe, as little conscious of anything as if no axe existed, even so that dull fool of mine,' etc. Lines 18 to 22 are perfectly straightforward—in fact, continuous and forming a simile, coherent in sense and Latinity. The point of the simile is obvious.

HAROLD P. COOKE.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

REVIEWS

PAGANISM AND CHRISTIANITY IN EGYPT.

Paganism and Christianity in Egypt.
By PHILIP DAVID SCOTT-MONCRIEFF. One vol. Pp. x + 226. One illustration from a photograph. The University Press, Cambridge, 1913. 6s. net.

THE publication of Mr. Scott-Moncrieff's posthumous work cannot but increase the number of those who realise what the world has lost by his early death. Its usefulness, however, should give it no small vogue, and should accordingly long perpetuate his name. He has put in nine chapters, pleasant to read and easy to grasp, what it has been possible to learn from the sepulchral remains recently excavated, from papyri, and from literature, about the religious beliefs and practices in Egypt

during the first centuries of the Christian era. It is a strange and wonderful revelation; the established religion of the Egyptians at the close of the Ptolemaic era, with roots deep set in secular traditions; the position at the beginning of the third century of our era, when a welter of pagan and Jewish and Christian beliefs had submerged those gaunt traditions; the impact of Christianity as revealed by literature and archaeology; the evidence of iconography; the Gnostics' speculations, so amazing to us, so impressive to many at the time; the rise of asceticism and monasticism—these are the subjects dealt with by the author. No better reading could be prescribed for all Divinity students, whom it is desired to liberate from fanatical impatience with defective

theologies. Since the book appeared M. Eugène de Faye (*Expositor*, February, 1915, XIII. Series, No. 50, pp. 108-131) has further contended that the great Gnostic founders, e.g. Basileides and Valentinus, were Christian philosophers, of at least respectable parts, who laboured to bring into a well-coordinated system the doctrines of Christianity and the pre-conceptions or accepted positions of current philosophic thought. Mr. Scott-Moncrieff also brings into the light the greatness of the Christian element subsisting in these heretical cults and the reflex action which they had upon later Catholicism.

The author carries the reader's judgment with him in his general contentions, but a few details deserve comment.

The author is, perhaps, a little oversceptical of the historicity of the traditional account of the origins of Christianity in Alexandria. The tendency of opinion probably now inclines rather the other way, as we have seen in Mr. Winstanley's Bampton Lectures. This ultra-scepticism leads the author to suppose that the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* and the *Gospel according to the Egyptians* preceded the four Canonical Gospels. Most students of the subject would say that in that case those two Gospels were practically contemporaneous with the occurrences they related. There seems reason to suppose that, however they stand to the Canonical Gospels in point of date, they contained some historical records independent of the Canon. Similarly with regard to the fragment from the *Egyptian Gospel*, which records our Lord's answer to Salome's question, 'how long death would prevail?' While the author declares that it implies that our Lord 'enjoined abstinence from all sexual intercourse as the Christian ideal' (p. 58), there seems good reason to understand the words 'Eat every plant, but that which is bitter eat not' as precisely parallel to St. Paul's 'Prove all things: hold fast that which is good,' and the gist of the teaching of the answer is entirely in harmony with modern biology. It seems, therefore, gratuitous to connect it with the Encratites (pp. 58-59).

Again, the author perhaps is in danger

of overlooking the severity and strictness ascribed to the character of the Judge of Mankind in the Canonical Gospels when he argues that this feature indicates that the *Gospel according to the Egyptians* was the source of a saying 'of a markedly ascetic character' (pp. 66-67).

Again, the author regards it (p. 72) as a remarkable point in the *Gospel of Peter* that 'the Resurrection and Ascension are put as taking place on the same day'; there are certainly some theologians who infer from the Canonical Gospels an Ascension on Easter Day without denying a final Ascension forty days afterwards.

One or two inscriptions found in Egyptian graves where Christian influence is traceable puzzle the author. Two suggestions may be offered:

- (a) MIKH, p. 110, is perhaps (*cf.* p. 173¹) *Mapì* (the Aramaic word known to us again in Maranatha) or *Mapias* Ἰησοῦς Κύριος ήμῶν.
- (b) XMT may, perhaps, conceal *Xριστὸς Μαπὶ Γέρνα* ('Lord and Son'), corresponding to Psinother in Egyptian (p. 170¹),

since M. J. J. Smirnoff's explanation, though highly attractive, leaves us to suppose that the long form found elsewhere is simply a misunderstanding of a forgotten original. Possibly we should read *Mapias*, and compare the words 'God, Son of Mary' which M. Alphonse Merguen quotes in *A New Document on Clement of Rome* (*Expositor*, 1914², VIII. 8th Series, p. 233).

The author refers to the statement in the *Pistis Sophia* that for eleven years after the Ascension our Lord instructed His disciples, and finally gave them the esoteric instruction contained in that book after ascending from them 'on the 15th of Tobe when the moon was full.' He makes no comment on this, but rightly notices in a footnote (p. 155) that this date is to be connected with the observance by Basileides' followers of the 15th (or as some said the 11th) of Tobi as the anniversary of our Lord's Baptism. Plainly there is a connexion also with the tradition that the Apostles remained at Jerusalem for twelve years,

and it is remarkable that the only year in which there was a full moon on 15th Tubi is 41 A.D. (the day that year being December 25), and it is generally agreed that that is the year as shown by the *Acts of the Apostles* in which the Apostles left Jerusalem. We seem to be justified, therefore, in supposing that this Gnostic statement, like many others, was no mere invention or dream, but rests upon some extra-canonical tradition. Further we are tempted to suppose that the time assigned to the Apostles' sojourn in Jerusalem is an echo of the true time from our Lord's Baptism to the Apostles' departure—that is to say, for over eleven years they with their Master ministered to the centre and nucleus of Judaism. The selection of the date for the crowning revelation of the *Pistis Sophia*, 15th Tubi, must again, it might appear, have its foundation in the fact that this was the anniversary of our Lord's Baptism. The date, then, for this will be 24 (perhaps 28) December, 30 A.D., and we may add that the moon was full on the afternoon of December 28.

In the chapter on Iconography one *obiter dictum* of the author's ought perhaps to be challenged. At Akhmin a figure 'possibly that of the Saviour,' 'probably to be attributed to the fourth century,' represents 'a young man with curly hair, beardless,' while 'a bearded

Christ seems to have been another and perhaps later tradition.' If Dr. Kirsopp Lake's contention that the Crucifixion was about 35 A.D. is accepted, it is possible that a bearded Christ is a relic of a true tradition. Similarly, it is perhaps as possible to see an echo of the Canonical *Apocalypse* in 'the father who is above the seven and within the seven' as of the *Pistis Sophia* and the *Books of Ieou* (p. 197).

It is satisfactory to find that the author turns his back on Weingarten's theory that 'no such thing as a monk existed before the year 340,' and recognises the substantial accuracy of the early history of Egyptian Monasticism. Had he lived, he would, perhaps, have worked out a little more thoroughly the chronology of the lives of St. Antony and Pakhōm, but the general drift of what he says is convincing enough. Since he wrote, M. Alphonse Merguen (*Expositor*, April, 1915, pp. 365-378) has been able to give some fresh light in *A New Document on Christian Monasticism in Egypt*.

In one or two places the author's text is apparently suffering from some form of misprint or has been carelessly expressed—p. 24, l. 24; p. 164, l. 17; p. 200, l. 20; but, this apart, the work, as was said in the first instance, is illuminating, interesting, and inspiring.

T. NICKLIN.

HOW DID THE GREEKS THINK ABOUT LIFE?

Kalypso. By ALDO FERRABINO. 12mo. Pp. viii + 448. Turin: Fratelli Bocca, 1914. L. 6.

The Greek Tradition. By J. A. K. THOMSON. Crown 8vo. Pp. xiv + 248. London: Allen and Unwin, 1915. 5s.

SIGNOR FERRABINO and Mr. Thomson have set themselves out to find not what we ought to think about the Greeks, but what the Greeks thought about themselves; and by implication they suggest what from the Greek standpoint we ought to think about ourselves. At any rate the Greeks were neither light-hearted, nor had they solved the

riddle of things. In place of primitive simplicity and calm, of that 'ease in Zion' which Matthew Arnold regarded as a characteristic of Hellenism, Goethe found long ago something altogether different. 'From Homer and Polygnotus I every day learn more clearly that in our life here above ground we have, properly speaking, to enact Hell.' For many a Greek, as for the Calvinist, life was a fierce conflict, with a dim but adequate bias towards the good. And so far as he overlooked that bias, Goethe's judgment inclined towards blasphemy. But here as elsewhere the German, who was also a great European,

helps even by his errors to cure us of our provincialism. In comparison with our perplexities the Greek mind strikes us as simple, and Greek art breathes calm over us when we return to it from the barbarian exterior of our modern streets. But the simplicity and the calm are an illusion. They reward a partial victory slowly and painfully won.

It is not altogether by accident, therefore, that Signor Ferrabino, in his penetrating and delightful study of classical myths, has chosen two stories of conflict in which a monster plays a part only to be overcome by the hero. Perseus and Hercules may indeed personify natural forces and come into their legends along the way marked out by the author. But when they are once there, they lose the marks of their origin. And it is at the moment of struggle that the myth culminates; and then it is seized upon by the poet for its dramatic possibilities. The studies which make up *Kalypso* trace with a sure touch the later accumulation of the incidents and details which in each case are used by the poet. In this field the poets 'do not create, but they put together familiar elements' (286). And after the poet comes the story-teller, the novelist, who also uses what they find to hand. Signor Ferrabino, therefore, removes the centre of interest in the myth to a much later place than that to which we are accustomed. It is more illuminating to trace the myth as it appears in the literature of Greece and Rome than to accumulate from primeval sources the numerous details which seem to throw light upon the origin of myth. For the investigation of origins, when it leaves the region of verified history, is as little original as poetry. It cannot create: it can only put together. We are left only too often with a problem that admits of many solutions, and with an indeterminate result. Valuable, therefore, as is the work done in seeking the origin of myth, it yields in real importance to such analysis of the manifestations of the mythopoeic faculty as that which Signor Ferrabino gives us in his sixth chapter.

Mr. Thomson, who also has a message, seems to write without knowledge of the book we have been considering, but

he says very much the same kind of thing. 'The ancient poet . . . treated a traditional theme in a conventional style and form, making it in fact the main part of his artistic effort that he should preserve the convention. But he does not merely reproduce, he renovates it.' Hence on both these computations the myth in the poetry, say, of Euripides or of Ovid is probably more living than at any moment in its previous history. When Abdera went mad over the *Andromeda* of Euripides, the heroine once more lived, according to Lucian, in the general remembrance. In like manner the artistic achievement of Ovid in the *Metamorphoses*, recognised I am glad to see by Signor Ferrabino, is something more than a mere shaking of dead bones. Ovid brought many a myth to life again, and for him as for Euripides the revived myth was the vehicle of an art palpitating with modernity. To employ the useful distinction of our Italian author, the mythopoeic achievement of Ovid is worlds apart from the mythological analyses of the historians and rationalists. And indeed the efforts of these last are compared in *Kalypso* (206) to the sprinkling of a 'livid' powder over the object. With the help of this distinction, I think, we must go on to change some values. In mythopoeic achievement Ovid stands at the top of the Roman poets, certainly before Virgil and Horace. Through the myth he catches the transformations, the 'metamorphoses' of life, and plays upon them like a musical composer with the repetitions of a fugue. He conforms to the first of the famous six canons of Chinese pictorial art, and traces 'the Life Movement of the Spirit through the Rhythm of Things,' refining away from the myth all that goes beyond the dramatic needs of his story-telling. 'The universe,' says Mr. Thomson, 'treads a measure, and our very blood is rhythmical. Not poetry nor the dance created rhythm; rather the instinct for rhythm created them' (208). 'In the story, the novel, the people,' says Signor Ferrabino, 'appears to condense along with its own hopes its own philosophy of life, because it fixes there . . . the characteristic models of the figures through

which the common lot moves' (289). Rhythm, movement, the dance, such are the formulae for life which recur in the two books before us, as they are recurring in present-day attempts to explain the creations of the painter and sculptor. In other words, so far as the vicissitudes of the individual life present themselves in a form which may be enacted again, to that extent are they the suitable material for the plot of a drama or novel. Hence the critic also must exhibit his author, not isolated on a pedestal, but sharing in some way in the common life, and by the very perfection of his movements, his style and handling of his material, carrying the common life so far as he represents it to a deeper harmony. On these lines Mr. Thomson well interprets Thucydides as loving Athens like a mistress (46), and Herodotus as the perfect explorer (18), Odysseus up to date.

In translation, I suppose, one simply repeats the rhythm in another musical key, and I further suppose, though this is a great concession, that the traditional grammar is a handbook for translations of this kind. 'It must be very hard to translate the classics,' says Mr. Thomson—so hard that I can scarcely think of a translation which does not make one regret that translations are necessary. It is no good talking about Fitzgerald and Omar

Khayyam. Anyone who knows something of the original Persian knows that the English version is really a new book. Curiously enough, in the translations which Mr. Thomson offers, he misses, I think, the meaning of the one phrase in the *Odyssey* which suggests the dancing rhythm of things (201). From the fact that he translates ῥοδοδάκτυλος ἡώς by 'rosy-fingered dawn,' I should suspect him of being secretly inclined to Samuel Butler's view that the *Odyssey* was written by a woman. For a woman to whom I referred the matter told me that she—and other women—admired pink fingers and approved of the traditional rendering. On the other hand, the poets are accustomed to speak of the feet rather than the hands along with the beauty of dawn. In Milton 'the still morn went out with sandals gray.' Sir John Suckling compared the dancing of a lady to the beauty of the sun on Easter Day. Not her hands, but her feet led up to the sun. So the golden sandals of Hermes bear him over land and sea (Ω 340). Hence surely ῥοδοδάκτυλος means 'rosy-toed.' In the spirit of these passages may I express the hope that Mr. Thomson will still contribute to the rhythmic movement of classical studies?

FRANK GRANGER.

University College, Nottingham.

THE ANACREONTEA.

The Anacreontea, etc. Translated into English Verse, with Essay, Notes and additional Poems. By J. F. DAVIDSON. 7" x 5". Pp. x + 212. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1914. 4s. 6d. net.

MR. DAVIDSON'S book contains an introductory essay on the life, character and influence of Anacreon, a translation of the Anacreontea into English verse, and verse translations of the lyric fragments and epigrams of Anacreon, followed by poems on Anacreon by ancient writers and by the translator, some experiments in Anacreontics, and a few miscellaneous translations. What Mr. Davidson says of Moore's

translation might be said generally of his own, that 'he avails himself of the liberties of paraphrase to a great extent, but he has preserved the spirit of the original in a praiseworthy manner.' He has not, however, sufficiently represented the restraint and cogent simplicity of this original: compare in *Ode VI.* (*Bergk* 41)—

Lovely Venus, beauty's queen,
Bacchus, loved of King and peasant.

with the directness of—

μετὰ τοῦ καλοῦ Λυαίον
καὶ τῆς καλῆς Κυθήρης

He is not so diffuse as Moore, but often

he is unnecessarily diffuse. The lines in *Ode XIV.* (*Bergk* 12)—

Yes, yes, I yield, O God of love !
I own thy proud imperious rule.
In vain all combats 'gainst thee prove,
Who strives with thee is but a fool.

are apparently Mr. Davidson's equivalent for θέλω θέλω φιλήσαι. And in fragment XIV. (*Bergk* 28) the original—
'Ασπίδα ρίψας ποταμοῦ καλλιρόου παρ'
 σχθας

has been amplified to—

Hard by the river's shelving banks
I left the broken scattered ranks ;
And having cast away my burnished shield
I fled apace from the red battle-field.

Mr. Davidson says justly that since Moore's day the language has been improved, its vocabulary enlarged, and the province of poetry enriched by a variety of new metres." In the latter respect especially Mr. Davidson has shown fertility and aptness: in his extension of vocabulary it may be questioned whether he is equally judicious. He seems over-fond of French words: it must always be a question when a foreign word has become sufficiently naturalised to receive civic rights in lyric poetry. While Milton's 'debonair' delights, different views may be held about *pirouette*, *savant*, *amour*, *agacerie*, *verve*, *lieu*; and other foreign words, such as *eidolon*, *manes*, and above all *minus*, *jar*. Mr. Davidson says:

To me the lyre of Homer bring
But minus the ensanguined string.

It is to be hoped that if he reprints his poems, it will be minus this ensanguined line. Moore's affectations were the small change of poetic currency in his time: 'ruby tide, nymph, gelid flow' and similar expressions would pass without comment in his youthful days, but Mr. Davidson sometimes has phrases like 'spicy gale' and 'rosy freight' that seem out of place, and at other times, as in *Ode XXXIV.* (*Bergk* 49), repeats Moore, where Moore has added to the original. But after all criticisms are made, the translator's work shows grace, skill, versatility, and spirit; and he has wisely enriched it with a few selected parallels from English literature. Unfortunately his illness has prevented him from looking over the proofs himself, and a certain number of slips are to be noted. On p. 14 a chronological mistake is made: Anaxagoras cannot have lived in the childhood of Anacreon; on p. 15 'and which,' and on p. 22 'settling' are ungrammatical; split infinitives spoil the poetry on pp. 163 and 209; on p. 67 'prithee whither comest, whither dost thou go?' probably misrepresents the meaning alike of Mr. Davidson and the Anacreontic poet who said πόθεν; other misprints are Canephorae (p. 26), Eustachius (p. 41), paraenia (p. 42), hybla (p. 188). The use of Cythera for Cytherea may be justified by the Greek poet's use, but seems a pity in an English translation.

A. S. OWEN.

DEAN'S COGNOMINA OF SOLDIERS.

A Study of the Cognomina of Soldiers in the Roman Legions. By L. R. DEAN. 8vo. Pp. 321. Princeton, N.J., 1916.

THIS is a dissertation presented to the Faculty of Princeton University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Its object is to collect and classify the cognomina of soldiers and of officers, up to the rank of first centurion, who served in the legions in the time of the Empire, to 'ascertain what the facts are in regard to the use of cognomina

among Roman citizens below the equestrian rank in this particular walk of life.' The subject was suggested by a remark of Bormann, that the names of two soldiers in an inscription of Carnuntum were perhaps chosen because they were suitable for soldiers, and by the lack of any exhaustive collection of Roman cognomina. The evidence is drawn from inscriptions and papyri.

Two-thirds of the volume are taken up with a digest of the statistical

material in the form of a list of names arranged in the alphabetical order of the cognomina, with the soldier's rank and legion, the date (where ascertainable), the provenance of the relative inscription, and the place of its publication. The list aims at being as complete as possible. It contains about 5,700 names. The author hopes that it will prove useful to those who may wish to study the legionaries for some other reason. It will; and they are not the only people who will thank him for his industry.

The dissertation itself consists of an introduction and three chapters. The introduction gives the necessary preliminary information, but the exposition seems to us somewhat confused. The facts are these. Cognomina are not common before the reign of Claudius or thereabouts. Later they became the rule. These later recruits, if already Roman citizens, must have assumed their cognomen either before enlistment or at the time of enlistment. If not already Roman citizens, they assumed it as part of their new Roman name. In either case the question arises: What cognomina did they assume, and can we discover the reason of their choice? Mr. Dean seems to imply that when 'toward the end of the first century the legions began to be recruited outside Italy' (a very inaccurate statement of the facts), the greater part, and on p. 10 apparently all, of the recruits were not Roman citizens, and therefore took their new names at the time of their enlistment; and in regard to those who were not yet Roman citizens, he is not sure that admission to citizenship was accompanied by a change of name: he says it 'probably' was, as if there could be a shadow of doubt.

Chapter I. deals with the more popular cognomina, giving in each case the geographical distribution of the inscriptions containing the name, and, so far as possible, the chronological data. Chapter II. classifies all the cognomina according to their form and meaning (adjectives subdivided according to their connotation, nouns, etc.), their endings, and, so far as they are non-Roman, their origin. Chapter III. contains supplementary paragraphs discussing

some questions connected with cognomina, and is chiefly a convenient résumé of views expressed by previous writers.

The general results are that both the earliest and the popular cognomina are very largely adjectival in form, and a certain number of them denote qualities suitable to soldiers; that in Africa, as has often been observed, particular cognomina, mostly adjectival or participial, are specially popular, because they were names of good omen or had a religious or moral significance, being probably in some cases translations of native Punic names, whereas others popular elsewhere were little used. But in the majority of cases it is not really possible to discover the reasons why particular names were chosen.

It is not easy to make a special study of this kind very readable, but there should be no difficulty in making the statements lucid. The author's style is not always happy, and his observations are sometimes obscure or positively misleading. We quote three examples. 'None of the men in the III. Augusta who bear the cognomen Honoratus are centurions. On this point one may compare the usage followed in the case of Fortunatus' (p. 32), which for some reason he has decided to be 'distinctly a cognomen for soldiers and petty officers,' although it is borne by five centurions. Is it meant that a soldier changed his cognomen when he became a centurion? We are told on p. 52 that 'C. Gavius Silvanus was *primipilus* of the VIII. Augusta at Taurini in the year 65.' The facts are that he never was *primipilus* at Turin, that he was not *primipilus* in 65, but *primipilaris* and tribune of a praetorian cohort at Rome, and that his centurionate fell many years before, apparently round about 43. The surprising statement that 'Ti. Claudio Vitalis was a centurion of several legions at Rome during the reign of Domitian' (p. 60) turns out to mean that the inscription which records his successive promotions from one legion to another was set up at Rome; unfortunately, this example is irrelevant to the inquiry, since Vitalis was by birth an *eques*. But in spite of such blemishes

and such geographical mistakes as Aprum, Pessenuntum (though the inscriptions in question do write 'domo Pessenunto'), and 'Iconium in Syria,'

Mr. Dean has done a solid piece of work which will be helpful to scholars.

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

Christ Church, Oxford.

A REVISION OF MELMOTH'S PLINY.

Pliny: Letters. With an English Translation by WILLIAM MELMOTH. Revised by W. M. L. HUTCHINSON. 2 vols. 8vo. Vol. i. pp. xvi + 536; vol. ii. pp. 440. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Wm. Heinemann; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1915. 5s. each.

A FELLOW-TRAVELLER of mine on a journey recently happened to glance through one of these volumes, and returned it with the remark 'How very wordy English looks beside Latin!' If he could have seen the real unpruned Melmoth translation of 1746, he would have been still more impressed with its luxurious overgrowth; and the reviser, Miss Hutchinson, is expressly conscious of the need for cutting down its exuberance. Melmoth's translation possessed merits of its own: it was written in easy idiomatic English, and there is still a pleasing ring in a style not inappropriate as an echo of a century of great letter-writers. Standing alone, it could be read as a minor English classic; but facing the original, as is required in the Loeb Classical Library, it would, if unrevised, have shown to great disadvantage; for the confronting Latin would have too manifestly reproached its inaccuracies and verbosity. Melmoth is not above translating *vitricus* as 'father-in-law,' and, like all wordy translators, has a trick of evading difficulties, so that a reader may suffer from exasperating desertion at points where the syntax is in the least complex. This is just where it is perilous to have to follow in his footsteps, as any one may prove by trying to make out from his version how he construed such a sentence as that in X. iv., *quibus singulis multum commendationis accessurum etiam ex meis precibus indulgentiae tuae credo*. Indeed, his work is much more an able though loose paraphrase than a transla-

tion, and the present age sets up different standards of translation from the eighteenth century, and dislikes to find little words and little phrases of an original swollen to mammothlike proportions. Modern taste, therefore, prefers to have Pliny's *quoque* rendered by 'even' instead of by Melmoth's 'I do not scruple to add': it revolts against the intolerable wordiness which turns *in contubernium adsumpsi* (X. xciv.) into 'I have admitted him into my family as my constant guest and domestic friend.' Probably it is in the more business-like correspondence of the Tenth Book that Melmoth's version appears most out of place. His leisurely amplitude does not so much matter in the chatty sort of letter common in the other books, but it rings untrue in some of Pliny's matter-of-fact reports to the emperor, and most of all in the brief, and sometimes almost sharp, replies of Trajan. So it is a ludicrous misrepresentation of the emperor's terseness to convert *elige* (X. lxii.) into 'I leave it to your own choice to pursue'—nine words for one—or *possit illis sufficere* (X. xl.) into 'will be sufficient to answer the use for which it is intended,' or *gymnasiis indulgent Graeculi* (*ibid.*) into 'these paltry Greeks are, I know, immoderately fond of gymnastic diversions.' When these eleven words are given for Trajan's three, it is clear that the measure has run over, and the style of the original is altered beyond recognition. On the other hand, to condense too rigorously is to lose all the flavour of Melmoth's English; so that a *media via* has to be followed.

This middle course is steered with considerable success in the present revision, which is eminently readable. The commission having been what it was, to base a translation on Melmoth's, one may congratulate the reviser upon the result. Skill and taste characterise the alterations, while the comparative

condensation and higher degree of exactness are distinct gains, the more to be appreciated, if one remembers that the Bohn Library issued an edition of Melmoth 'revised and corrected' which retained many of his blunders. The opening sentence of VIII. xxiv. is fairly typical of the amount of excision; there the Latin has 23 words, Miss Hutchinson 41, and Melmoth 60; or, again, the mode of treatment may be illustrated from the same letter, where *se primus ipse contemnit* is neatly rendered 'sets the example by his self-contempt' to replace the characteristic eighteenth-century turn 'first breaking through that awful reverence he owes to himself.' At the same time, many things are retained that I personally should have altered, just as there are other things which I should have retained; but *de gustibus non disputandum*, and one admits that if the excisions were too drastic, the translation would cease to be in any real sense Melmoth's.

In some passages there is at once too little compression of fulness and too much change of quite passable words: e.g. in IV. ix. 2 the nine Latin words *Titum timuit ut Domitiani amicus, a Domitiano relegatus est* get thirty words in the present version 'during the reign of Titus, he was under continual apprehension of his resentment, as being a known friend to Domitian, yet when the latter ascended the throne, Bassus was exiled.' In this the italics represent the changes, 'reign' for Melmoth's 'time,' 'resentment' for 'displeasure,' and 'a known friend to' for 'known to favour the interests of.' How little Melmoth's words are treated as sacrosanct may be seen in VIII. xxiv. 8, where his 'more valuable than liberty' becomes 'more precious than liberty,' and his 'good opinion' becomes 'approbation.' And, while in general greater brevity is secured, there are occasions on which Melmoth is out-Melmothed: e.g. in X. xxix., is not 'whose merit I must always mention with esteem' good measure, pressed down and shaken, for *egregius?* Melmoth himself is content with 'very excellent.'

As it is, since comparatively few sentences are absolutely unchanged, one is doubtful whether the translation should

be called more than Melmothian or Melmothesque; and this suggests one aspect of the reviser's literary skill; for pains have been taken to preserve the manner of the eigtheenth century in the new patches which were necessary. Thus, 'distaste the entertainments' in IX. xvii., though not Melmoth's, is good old-fashioned English. It may be questioned, however, whether the desire for the quaint justifies the introduction in some places of obsolete grammar like 'he had wrote,' 'I had spoke' and syntax like 'their very age, which as it is venerable in men, in states it is sacred' (vol. ii. p. 169). There is no need to be more antique than Melmoth himself. Presumably, the influence of the eighteenth century is accountable for a somewhat arbitrary retention of initial capitals in some words like 'Loyalty' and 'Dining-room,' and for a few slight inconsistencies in spelling, viz. 'chase' in vol. i. p. 117, but 'chace' in vol. ii. p. 213; 'compleat' in i. p. 147, but 'completed' in ii. p. 101; 'a sett of pantomimes' in ii. p. 61, but 'a set of men' a few lines below. 'Scrutore,' ii. p. 75, and 'scrutoire,' ii. p. 101, keep the variation found in Melmoth editions.

Allusion has been made to the laudable correction of many of Melmoth's errors. On the other hand, certain mistakes have crept in. There seems no good reason why *annum sexagensimum excessit*, II. iii., should be 'he is above sixty-three years of age.' *Occasio scribendi vel rara vel nulla*, III. xvii., cannot mean 'no few opportunities of conveying your letters.' *A Continuation, in one book, of the thirty books of Aufidius Bassus* is not a right translation of *A fine Aufidi Bassi triginta unus*, III. v. Here Melmoth allows that Pliny added thirty books; the present reviser allows one. Put together, they give a result equal to the Latin. The elder Pliny's history, as we know from the *Natural History* (ii. 199 and *prae*. 20), dealt with Nero, Vespasian, and Titus, and it is unimaginable that one book could have exhausted his subject. Nor is *senatus tamen id quoque similis querenti laudibus tulit*, VIII. vi. 10, equivalent to 'yet even this the Senate endured,' and while adopting an injured tone applauded as follows,' and Melmoth here at least is

more correct—‘yet even this the senate applauded and seemed to lament in the following clause.’

Some other changes are not to the good. The translation at III. xvi. *ad init.*, ‘those which have been most celebrated have not always been the most illustrious,’ loses the meaning of *alia clariora esse alia maiora*, and is less sensible than Melmoth’s ‘those which have been the most celebrated have not always been the most worthy of admiration.’ Melmoth has the advantage also in X. iv. of expressing *emancipavit* by ‘conveyed’ rather than by ‘realised’: *in emancipatione* which follows, and is left untranslated, refers to formalities regularly demanded by Roman law ‘in a valid conveyance’ of property. In ‘sickness which has lately run through my family’ for *infirmitates meorum*, VIII. xvi. i., ‘household’ would be better than ‘family’; *iudiciis*, X. iv. *sub fin.*, implies not merely ‘favourable regards’ but the emperor’s ‘powers of discernment’; *praefinire*, X. viii. *sub fin.*, is more than ‘limit’; *numeros*, X. xxix., would be clearer as ‘muster-roll’ than as ‘legion.’ Occasionally Latin phrases are left untranslated, e.g. *moretur in libertate* in IV. x., which Melmoth, however, represents by ‘let Modestus enjoy his freedom’; and *peregrinae condicionis* in X. v. The heading for VII. i. ‘To Restitutus’ is a puzzling translation to retain of the Latin supercription *Geminio suo*.

A few oversights occur in the printing.

In vol. I., p. 10 *Vitellianae* for *Vitelliana*; p. 98 *asequi*. At p. 192 and p. 286 respectively ‘(Plin.) iv. 33’ and ‘Thuc. ii. 403’ are impossible references. On p. 319 *eclogas sive, ut multi, poëmatia* is misrendered in the English by ‘Eclogues (as many others have), Little Poems,’ where presumably *or* has fallen out and a vagrant comma attaches *ut multi* to the wrong noun. In volume II., p. 18 *illud versum* should be either *illud verbum* or *illum versum*; p. 55 *dipositions*; p. 107 *singlar*; p. 109 *treaties for entreaties*; p. 165 *Pannoniad* for *Pannonia*; p. 171 *tranforms*; p. 172 *forte* for *sorte*; p. 217 *Ruso* for *Ruso*.

The text followed is based on that published by the Bipontine Press in 1789 with a revision in the light of the chief modern editions. Some of the important variant readings are recorded in notes; but textual criticism does not come within the scope of this edition, as the preface points out. The biographical index of notable personages in the letters is good so far as it goes; it deals, however, with fewer than thirty names and so cannot convey an adequate view of Pliny’s circle. One misses names like Silius Italicus and Martial and Caecina Paetus and Pliny’s wife Calpurnia; and, if Decebalus and Pacorus are princes too remote, why should there not be an entry for Trajan himself?

J. WIGHT DUFF.

*Armstrong College,
University of Durham.*

THREE TRANSLATIONS OF VIRGIL.

The Eclogues and Georgics of Virgil.
Translated by J. W. MACKAIL. Longmans.

Virgil: Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid i.-vi.
H. R. FAIRCLOUGH. Heinemann:
Loeb Series.

Georgics and Eclogues of Virgil. Translated into English verse by THEODORE CHICKERING WILLIAM. With introduction by GEORGE HERBERT PALMER. Harvard University Press: Humphrey Milford.

Cupido difficilia faciendi continues to give the world new translations of Virgil.

It is all to the good: one cannot have too many: but all remain standing confutations of the statement, so frequently made by the experts of the daily Press, that you need not learn Latin and Greek because you can get all the best of antiquity in translations. This singularly crude judgment no doubt rests, like most popular errors, on a modicum of truth. Greek and Latin poetry (Greek, perhaps, rather oftener than Latin) can be done into English and still retain an appreciable part of itself. Something of the Homeric spirit may survive in a good prose translation: something of the

Horatian effect is not beyond the compass of English verse. But Virgil can only be read in Latin, if he is to remain Virgil: he, and perhaps he alone, has up to the present wholly defied reproduction. Yet poets attempt him, and scholars: and sometimes those who are both scholars and poets.

Here, for instance, are two prose versions, one of the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, one of the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* and half the *Aeneid*. Mr. Mackail's, it may be said at once, is excellent. Nothing could be more faithful, nothing in better taste: there is no expression that is not well chosen. But no version (certainly no prose version) can get over the obvious fact that the Virgilian word is a part of the Virgilian hexameter. It is not really true that all the charm of all the Muses often flowers in a *lonely* word. The magic is partly in the choice of the word: but much more in the indefinable but none the less intimate link of the detail with the whole of the phrase or the line. What Virgil has said cannot be said in any other way. If any master of the English language could do the trick, it would be Mr. Mackail. It is precisely because of his great gifts as a translator that we are more and more convinced that the trick cannot be done: not though the half-penny and even the penny Press confidently assert the contrary.

The Loeb translation is also excellent—indeed, there is very little to choose between Mr. Fairclough and Mr. Mackail. Here and there (but real discrepancies are, as one would expect, very rare) it is possible to say that one is more faithful than the other. If, for instance, Mr. Mackail is clearly right in translating 'prunis lapidosa rubescere corna' (*Geor.* II. 34) 'plums reddens on the stony cornel'—Mr. Fairclough sees 'stony cornels blushing on the plum'—per-

contra, a few lines farther on, the Loeb version may cry quits with Mr. Mackail. In view of the context, most will probably agree that 'in manibus terrae' should rather be rendered 'the land is close at hand' than 'the earth is in hand.' Perhaps, if one may generalise, it is possible to say that Mr. Fairclough is a trifle the more literal, and Mr. Mackail a thought the more impeccably tasteful.

Of course it is still easier to find fault with verse translations. They attempt more: they may rise much higher than prose, and they take the corresponding risk of falling a great deal lower. To translate Virgil into English verse is a noble enterprise, but one that bristles with difficulties. Humanity being what it is, the mere limitations of metre almost inevitably compel a trifle of insertion here and omission there: and, a word too much or too little, and the delicate Virgilian nuance of meaning—no artistry is more subtle—may be lost. It was not therefore to be expected that Professor Williams' version of the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* should be quite as faithful to the exact meaning as Mr. Mackail's or Mr. Fairclough's. Yet (although blank verse is far away from the Virgilian hexameter) metrical effect may reproduce what prose never can: and Professor Williams' blank verse is singularly pleasing: the general result justifies the warmth of his friend Mr. Palmer's Introduction. The translation throughout—which the author had just completed before his death, but not revised—is the work of a good scholar, a man of taste, and a sincere lover of Virgil. As such, Professor Williams would probably have confessed that the added knowledge of Virgilian beauties must always be the translator's best reward, whether he work in prose or verse.

A. D. G.

SHORT NOTICES

English Greek Lexicon. By G. M. EDWARDS. Second Edition, 1914. 8½" x 6¾". Cambridge University Press. 9s. net.

THE book contains an interesting Introduction (23 pp.) on the different kinds of Greek (chiefly based on Rutherford's *New Phrynicus*), on the resources of the language, etc. The Lexicon, which is clearly printed in double columns, occupies 300 pages. It is a pity the quantities are not marked; it is a very simple matter to mark long *a*, *t*, *u*, when not circumflexed, and, if a word is new to us, we do want to know how to pronounce it. There follows an Index of Proper Names (22 pp.). In the new edition there is a Supplement containing 8 pp. of additional phrases, and notes on the Greek equivalents of certain words, e.g. mind, with, go.

The author is evidently interested in the language, and has done his work well, but we must confess to some disappointment with the result. The object of the book is to help us to use in our compositions the great store of words which the Greek language possesses. In writing verse, especially, the secret of success is to have at one's command an abundant choice of words, and here an English Greek Lexicon may be helpful. In our opinion the selection given in this book is not large enough. A good deal of space is used in giving information which most of us would find elsewhere easily enough (e.g. all the derivatives of *τρεῖς* given under Third and Three). We open the *Rhesus* at random at line 393 and note a few words which a verse writer might not think of and might be glad to have suggested. These are not given in the Lexicon under the English words named nor under any obvious synonym: *κάμνειν*, *συγκάμνειν* (toil), *έπισκηπτω* (charge, order), *μελῳδός* (musical), *διπλοῦς* (false, treacherous), *βοηθοροῦ* (rescue; it is, however, given under 'help') These are all common enough to be worth recording; the first two are indispensable. Σ.

An Introduction to Greek Reading. By G. ROBERTSON. Cambridge University Press. 113 pp., 2s. 6d. net.

WE recommend those who teach beginners to get this book and examine it. To us it seems an excellent book for an intelligent pupil who has made a start in Greek and got hold of a few hundred words and the commonest inflexions. Our judgment is confirmed by a pupil, aged sixteen, who took a great fancy to the book and worked through it with pleasure and profit. It contains a great variety of short passages almost all of which are in themselves interesting. There is no Greek English Vocabulary, but the reader can find out the meaning of each word easily enough from the notes on each passage or by reference to the earlier parts of the book. So far as possible the Greek words are connected with English or Latin words: 'The principle on which I have worked is that it is both easier and more educative to remember that *ἀριστός* means "best" because we know that "aristocracy" means "the rule of the best," than to accept the information as a piece of irrational fact unrelated to anything previously known.' Unfortunately it often happens that the English derivative does not help us to remember the meaning of the Greek word. We may know that 'oxygen' comes from *ὄξυς* and yet not be able to say what *ὄξυς* means. But for all that the idea is a valuable one, and the author has applied it with great success. Σ.

Lucian. Vol. II. (Loeb Series). Translated by A. M. HARMON. 6½" x 4½". Pp. viii + 520. London: Heinemann, 1915. 5s. net.

THIS second volume includes nine of Lucian's works, not perhaps as interesting as those in the first volume, but the translation exhibits equal merit. It is eminently readable, and shows ease and elegance, without becoming a mere paraphrase. It may be questioned

whether some modern slang expressions such as 'kowtowed' and 'humans' are appropriate, though modern equivalents for ancient things, such as cancan (*κόρδαξ*), truce of God (*έκεχειρία*) and trade-unionists (*τεχνῖται*) are unexceptionable. Jokes are well reproduced, and notes are sparingly given at the foot of the page to explain the allusions.

A. S. OWEN.

Verse Translation from Classic Authors.
(New Edition). By C. E. F. STARKEY,
M.A. 7½" x 4¾". Pp. 164. Hove,
Sussex : Combridge. Cloth, 5s. net.

ONE half of this volume is devoted to translations from Horace's *Odes*; the other half is divided between Sophoclean choruses, Catullus, and Lucretius. Mr. Starkey has employed a great variety of metres, but has not always used that which is most suited to the spirit of the original. At times he seems jaunty as in the translation of Hor. *Od.* i. 10, and it jars upon us when the deserted Ariadne sings :

'He's upon mid-ocean,
Not a soul is near me,
Fate with cruel triumph
In my strait would jeer me;
Grudging me the solace
Of an ear to hear me.'

Sometimes we catch the note of the modern hymn : that is especially so in the choruses of Sophocles which some-

times suggest the Scotch psalter, while in the translation of Hor. *Od.* I. 24 we have an uncomfortable reminiscence of Bishop Heber in—

'Our dear one is gone, and we fain must deplore him,
Unchecked in our yearning, unashamed in our moan.
Melpomene, teach us a dirge to chant o'er him,
O dowered by the father with silvery tone!'

In language he has done little to reproduce the different styles of the poets he translates. It is difficult to feel that Lucretius is the original, when we read—

'Glamour of poetry is o'er my lay.'

On the whole he has been more successful with Horace in this respect, as he has caught something of the feeling of *Hours in Idleness*, and even in the more dignified poems (as *Od.* I. 35) is satisfactory when, as in that instance, his metre does not make him flippant. These verses were written for the translator's more advanced pupils. There may have been at least a smile at the lines—

Yes ! night's harbinger is blazing
Over Oeta in the skies.
They are bursting from the banquet.

But perhaps care was taken that Oeta should be pronounced as unlike 'eater' as possible.

A. S. OWEN.

IN MEMORIAM.

'SOMEWHERE IN FRANCE.'

EST ubi te terra, beate miles,
exulem condit socialis atque
pectore in grato tenet et tenebit
omne per aevum.

Flore primaevō veluti virentis
de tuo flores speciem cruore,
sic feret vires speciosa tellus,
Gallia palmam.

Nec, puer fortis, morieris omnis ;
at tuus flos usque animi virebit
iam tuo terra cineri iacentis
consociata.

H. P. COOKE.

*Armstrong College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*

NOTES AND NEWS

THE BRITISH ACADEMY

CROMER GREEK PRIZE.

WITH the view of maintaining and encouraging the study of Greek, particularly among the young, in the national interest, Lord Cromer has founded an Annual Prize, to be administered by the British Academy, for the best Essay on any subject connected with the language, history, art, literature, or philosophy of Ancient Greece.

The first annual prize, of £40, will be awarded before the end of 1917, under the following Rules :

1. Competition is open to all British subjects of either sex who will be under twenty-six years of age on October 1, 1917.

2. Any such person desirous of competing must send in to the Secretary of the British Academy on or before December 1, 1916, the title of the subject proposed by him or her. The Academy may approve (with or without modification) or disapprove the subject ; their decision will be intimated to the competitor as soon as possible.

3. Preference will be given, in approval of subjects proposed, to those which deal with aspects of the Greek genius and civilization of large and permanent significance over those which are of a minute or highly technical character.

4. Any Essay already published, or already in competition for another prize of the same nature, will be inadmissible.

5. Essays of which the subject has been approved must be sent in to the Secretary of the Academy on or before October 1, 1917. They must be typed (or, if the author prefers, printed), and should have a note attached stating the main sources of information used.

6. It is recommended that the Essays should not exceed 20,000 words, exclusive of notes. Notes should not run to an excessive length.

7. The author of the Essay to which the prize is awarded will be expected to publish it (within a reasonable time, and after any necessary revision), either separately, or in the Journals or Transactions of a Society approved by the Academy, or among the Transactions of the Academy.

The Secretary of the Academy will supply on application, to any person qualified and desirous to compete, a list which has been drawn up of some typical subjects, for general guidance only, and without any suggestion that one or another of these subjects should be chosen, or that preference will be given to them over any other subject of a suitable nature.

Communications should be addressed to 'The Secretary of the British Academy, Burlington House, Piccadilly, London, W.'

Two more *Occasional Publications* have recently been issued by the Classical Association : No. 4, *Some Roman Conceptions of Empire*, by Professor Haverfield ; and *Penelope in the Odyssey*, by Dr. Mackail. Members of the Association receive copies of these papers as they appear, but they only receive one copy apiece, and as applications for more have been coming in from various quarters, arrangements have now been made whereby additional copies of Nos. 4 and 5 may be obtained, at a cost of sixpence per copy, exclusive of postage, on application to the Hon. Secretary. Nos. 1-3 are out of print.

CORRESPONDENCE

DRAMAS AND DRAMATIC DANCES OF
NON-EUROPEAN RACES : A REPLY.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS.—It seems ungrateful to make any reply to Dr. Maret's very kind review of my book (*C.R.*, August, pp. 159-162), especially as he says that 'in the interests of pure fighting I could almost wish that I did not agree with Professor Ridgeway as fully as I do.' But there are one or two points on which it is necessary to set the reader right. Dr. Maret practically confines himself to a defence of his own doctrine that '*mana*' is a root-principle of explanation applying to the origin of magic and religious rites,' a doctrine which I have controverted in my book (pp. 48-49; 349-350). I hold not only that magic is not a stage prior to religion as held by Sir James Frazer, but also that there is no ground for regarding *mana* as something absolutely distinct from, or antecedent to, the belief in the existence of the soul after the death of the body. My reason for this later belief is that as 'spirits and ghosts are apt to possess *mana*', yet as all ghosts do not possess it, but only those that are specially potent *tindalos* (ghosts of dead chiefs), its explanation seems to lie in the fact that those ghosts who are supposed to possess it were powerful and important persons in life, just as in other countries and in other creeds the power of working miracles, or of giving protection in sanctuaries, does not belong to all dead persons, but only to great warriors, saints, and the like. In other words, I consider *mana* to be one of the secondary phenomena that spring from and depend on the primary belief in the immortality of the soul. Dr. Maret supplies strong evidence in favour of this view, for whilst he urges that French caves of the Reindeer Age, which he places about 15,000 years ago, afford strong indications of hunting rites of the kind that figure so prominently in the *Golden Bough*, admits that 'Mousterian man of the Mid-Pleistocene period,' whose date he places at a 'beggarly 50,000' years ago, 'buried his dead with an eye to their comfort in a future state'—a fact strongly in favour of the priority of the belief in the immortality of the soul to magic as a root-principle. Whilst Sir James Frazer holds that magic is a stage prior to religion, and Dr. Maret regards *mana* as belonging to 'pre-animistic religion,' the examination of a long series of facts led me to conclude that religion is at least as early a stage as magic and certainly is not later. Dr. Maret now seems to have dropped his doctrine of 'pre-animistic religion,' and he says that 'he is sorry that (he) has managed to convey a false impression to Professor Ridgeway, and still more sorry that he should find it inconvenient to give that false impression up.' 'My view' (he proceeds) 'has always been that *mana*, or wonder-working power, may be

attributed to a rite that in its inception has nothing to do with animism, but is inspired by some other notion—for instance, by what Sir James Frazer would call magic, the sympathetic principle. Thus the Melanesian picks up a stone that is fearfully and wonderfully shaped in the likeness of a yam, and concludes that it has *mana* for making yams grow.'

I believe that the wonder-working power is suggested in the first instance simply by the fact that the stone is so wonderfully like a yam. If the Melanesian, as apparently happens, explains the efficacy of his charm, not on the ground that like produces like, but on the ground that the stone has 'eaten ghost,' I assume this to be a secondary gloss due to what Professor Ridgeway would himself call 'a natural extension of the ghost theory.' The sympathetic principle, on the other hand, whether reflectively grasped or not, undoubtedly operates as a motive, I regard as the primary source of the attribution of *mana* to the stone and to the fertility rites that make use of the stone, and therefore in such a context would term the underlying motive 'pre-animistic.'

I am sorry if I am labouring under a false impression respecting Dr. Maret's doctrine that there was a pre-animistic stage in the evolution of religion. He has only himself to blame, for he wrote in the Preface to *His Threshold of Religion* (p. ix): 'It would be untrue to deny that the term pre-animistic was used by me *designedly* and with a chronological reference' (the italics are mine). With these words it is hard to reconcile his later statement now repeated that there are 'other conditions not less primary [than animism]. If *mana* is not more primary than animism, why did he place it (*mana*) under the head of pre-animistic religion, in which phrase he admits that the qualifying adjective is used "designedly," and with chronological reference?'

The example which Dr. Maret presents, e.g., the stone shaped like a yam, so far from substantiating his statement that 'it can be shown conclusively that in some cases animistic interpretations have been superimposed upon what previously bore non-animistic sense,' adds another proof to my case. For he himself admits that the Melanesian regards the *mana* in such a stone as due to the indwelling of a ghost; and to the positive statement of the Melanesian respecting his own belief, Dr. Maret has no other reply than his own *a priori* assumption unsupported by any facts from Melanesia or anywhere else.

I may also point out that since my book appeared, Mr. Hocart, a clever Oxford anthropologist, who has studied carefully the problem of *mana* during his residence in the Pacific, has rejected Dr. Maret's hypothesis in a powerful paper in the *American An-*

thropologist. But even if Dr. Marett could substantiate his assumption respecting the yam-shaped stone, this would not prove that animism did not precede in time the vague notions attached to certain objects 'which later received full animistic interpretation.' Dr. Marett from his standpoint was bound to hold that 'evolution in religion proceeds from the indistinct to distinct, from the undifferentiated to the differentiated, from the incoherent to the coherent.' Now as he also holds that 'religion in its psychological aspect is fundamentally a mode of social behaviour' tested his preceding statement by an appeal to the facts of primitive society, and I had no difficulty in showing that so far from primitive man being vague, indistinct, and undifferentiating in his notions respecting everything of importance to himself, the Australian aborigines, for example, have almost complex system of nomenclature and a precision of sight, hearing, and smell unknown to civilised man.

Finally, Dr. Marett disputes my statement that I have proved my case by an induction

based on facts drawn from the whole world, and whilst he admits that my 'induction is fairly searching as regards Asia,' he declares that 'it is miserably inadequate with regard to the rest of the primitive world. Four pages for Australia will hardly satisfy the anthropologist, nor would forty pages.' If I had copied out all the available evidence from the manifold tribes of Australia, New Guinea, etc., I would have filled several volumes with useless repetitions, and the reader could not have seen the wood for the trees. The question is, Can another series of examples controverting my theory be discovered amongst the numerous tribes not dealt with? I took typical examples from every separate race, and as Dr. Marett with his wide ethnological knowledge, after having nine months in which to search, has not been able to cite a single instance contrary to my long series of facts, it may be safely assumed that I have not omitted a single instance which made against my doctrine.

WILLIAM RIDGEWAY.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * * Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Bourne (Ella). A Study of Tibur, Historical, Literary, and Epigraphical, from the Earliest Times to the Close of the Roman Empire (Dissertation for Doctorate). $9\frac{1}{4}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 76. Collegiate Press: Menasha, Wisconsin. 1916.

Cicero (On Old Age). Translated into English Verse by Sir Robert Allison. $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$. Pp. xvi + 54. London: A. F. Humphreys. 1916. Paper boards, 1s. 6d. net.

Collignon (M. Maxime). L'Emplacement du Cécropion à l'Acropole d'Athènes. $11\frac{1}{2}'' \times 9''$. Pp. 17, with three photographic plates. Paris: C. Klincksieck. 1916. Fr. 2.80.

Deigma (A First Greek Book). By C. Flamstead Walters and R. S. Conway, with the co-operation of Constance I. Daniel. $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$. Pp. xxiv + 408, with a map and four illustrations. London: John Murray. 1916. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

Euripides (Rhesus). Edited by W. H. Porter. $6\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$. Pp. lii + 97. Cambridge: University Press. 1916. Cloth.

Harris (J. Rendel). The Origin of the Cult of Artemis. $10\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 40. London: Longmans and Co. 1916. Half cloth, 1s. net.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology (Vol. XXVII.). $9'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. vi + 176. Oxford: University Press (for Harvard University Press). 1916. Paper boards, 6s. 6d. net.

Jones (R. M.) The Platonism of Plutarch (Doctor's Dissertation). $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 153. Chicago: University Press. 1916.

Karpinski (L. C.) Robert of Chester's Latin Translation of the Algebra of Al-Khowarizmi, with introduction, notes, and an English version by L.C.K., University of Michigan. $10\frac{1}{2}'' \times 7\frac{1}{4}''$. Macmillan.

Loeb Library. Virgil, Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I.-VI. By H. R. Fairclough. $6\frac{1}{2}'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xiv + 571. London: W. Heinemann. 1916. Cloth, 5s. net.

Manning (C. A.) A Study of Archaism in Euripides. $9'' \times 6''$. Pp. xii + 98. Oxford Press (for Columbia University Press). 1916. Cloth, 5s. 6d. net.

Tacitus (Germania). By D. R. Stuart. $6\frac{1}{2}'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xxiii + 139, with a map. London: Macmillan and Co. 1916. Cloth, 3s. net.

Theologisch Tijdschrift. Aflevering IV. en V. Edited by B. D. Erdmans. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6''$. Pp. 267 + 432. Leiden: S. C. van Doesburgh. 1916.

Ussani (Vincenzo). Le Satire d'Orazio. $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. viii + 210. Napoli: F. Perrella. 1916. L. 2.

Van Wageningen. De Ciceronis Libro Consolationis. $11'' \times 7\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. 54. Groningen: P. Noordhoff. 1916. Paper boards, F. 2.10; M. 3.50.

Virgil (Aeneid) in English Verse. Vol. I. (Books I.-III.). By A. S. Way. $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. iv + 144. London: Macmillan and Co. 1916. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

Walters (H. B.) A Classical Dictionary. $9'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. x + 1103, with 580 illustrations. Cambridge: University Press. 1916. Cloth, 21s. net.

world,
on is
laries
gard
ages
chro-
had
the
nea,
with
not
ues-
con-
ngst
took
ace,
tical
in
te a
s of
have
made

v.

for
shed

atin
mi,
ish
an.

ies,
 $\frac{1}{2}$ ".
nn.

in
ord
16.

$\frac{3}{4}$ ".
ac-

V.
p.

gh.

io.

er-

so-

n :

o;

I.

$\frac{1}{2}$ ".

o.

y.

s.

h,